arXiv:1610.02985v1 [math.AP] 10 Oct 2016

The Calderón problem for connections

Mihajlo Cekić

Abstract

In this paper we consider the problem of identifying a connection ∇ on a vector bundle up to gauge equivalence from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map of the connection Laplacian $\nabla^*\nabla$ over conformally transversally anisotropic (CTA) manifolds. This was proved in [10] for line bundles in the case of the transversal manifold being simple – we generalise this result to the case where the transversal manifold only has an injective ray transform. Moreover, the construction of suitable Gaussian beam solutions on vector bundles is given for the case of the connection Laplacian and a potential, following the works of [11]. Consequently, this enables us to construct the Complex Geometrical Optics (CGO) solutions and prove our main uniqueness result. Finally, we prove the recovery of a flat connection in general from the DN map, up to gauge equivalence, using an argument relating the Cauchy data of the connection Laplacian and the holonomy.

1 Introduction

The full Calderón problem consists in determining a metric g on a manifold up to an isometry that fixes every point of the boundary from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann (DN) map. It has been one of the main drives in the area of geometric inverse problems. In this generality the problem is still open, but considerable partial results exist under suitable assumptions on g. There are variations of this problem that are physically motivated and which have received a lot of attention – namely, one can consider the operator $\Delta + X + q$, where X is a first order term related to the magnetic potential and q is a zero order term related to the electric potential.

Moreover, a very interesting case is the one of the "twisted" or connection Laplacian $\mathcal{L} = \nabla^*\nabla$, where ∇ is the covariant derivative. Let us consider a Hermitian vector bundle E over a Riemannian manifold (M, g) (equipped with a fibrewise Hermitian inner product) and a unitary connection A on E. A *gauge equivalence* ψ is a section of the automorphism bundle $\mathrm{Aut}E$, that is a bundle isomorphism that preserves the Hermitian structure. One then has a natural gauge invariance of the DN map (denoted by Λ_A for the corresponding operator $\mathcal{L}$) associated with the connection Laplacian on the vector bundle E; more precisely, if we denote the pullback connection by $\nabla_B = \psi^*\nabla_A = \psi\nabla_A\psi^{-1}$ and in addition we assume $\psi|_{\partial M} = Id$, then $\Lambda_A = \Lambda_B$. As with many similar problems, the question is: is this the only obstruction to injectivity? One can then pose the following:

Conjecture 1.1. *Given two unitary connections A and B on E, we have the equivalence: $\Lambda_A = \Lambda_B$ if and only if there exists a gauge equivalence that is the identity at the boundary that pulls back B to A.*

This problem is solved completely for the case of surfaces in [1]. In higher dimensions there are several partial cases considered: [10, 7, 9]. The two most relevant for us are Eskin's result in [7] which solves the Conjecture 1.1 when M is a domain in Euclidean

space with Euclidean metric and the result in [10] which considers the line bundle case, where (M, g) is assumed to have the admissible property. The approach we will take is the one initiated by Sylvester and Uhlmann [27] and later generalised by [10] and others – it can be briefly described in steps as:

1. Prove a suitable integral identity based on integration by parts.
2. Prove the necessary Carleman estimates and obtain the existence of the Complex Geometrical Optics (CGO) solutions.
3. Insert these solutions in the identity and use their density to make a global conclusion about the involved quantities.
4. Reduce the problem to a question of injectivity of an X-ray transform (or some other transform).

In this work, we have mostly restricted our attention to the special class of manifolds defined below (this is the setting discussed in [10] and [11]):

Definition 1.2. Let (M, g) be a smooth compact, oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, with boundary and let $T = (\mathbb{R} \times M_0, e \oplus g_0)$, where e is the Euclidean metric and (M_0, g_0) a Riemannian manifold with boundary of dimension $n-1$. We say that (M, g) is *conformally transversally anisotropic* (CTA) if (M, cg) is isometrically embedded into T for some positive function c on M.

In this paper, we have completely covered and proved the conjecture for line bundles, in the case of CTA manifolds and with the hypothesis of injectivity of the ray transform on the transversal manifold M_0 (see Theorem 1.3) – this result is new in the sense that we have significantly weakened the hypothesis on M_0. In order to state the Main Theorem, we need to set up some notation: let $F(-\infty) = F = \{x \in \partial M \mid \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \nu(x) \rangle = c(x)\nu_1(x) \leq 0\}$, which we call the *front side* and the analogous set with $\leq$ replaced with $>$ we call the *back side*; here $\nu(x)$ is the outer normal. We also use the notation $\partial M_- = F$ and $\partial M_+ = \overline{B}$ (see Figure 1). Moreover, we remark that this setting was used in [9] in order to prove a suitable partial data result in Euclidean domains; the analogy with our case is that we are considering rays from the "point at infinity", rather than from the points near the boundary. Finally, the CGO solutions that are supported in a front or a back face were constructed by Chung in [5] for Euclidean domains – this probably implies such solutions could be constructed in our setting, however due to technical reasons and simplicity we will deal only with the full Dirichlet data. We prove the following result:

Theorem 1.3 (Main Theorem)**.** *Let (M, g) be a CTA manifold. Let E be a Hermitian line bundle over M, equipped with unitary connections A_1 and A_2. Assume furthermore the injectivity of the ray transform on functions and 1-forms on M_0. If Γ is a neighbourhood of the front face of M, then the partial Cauchy data spaces*[1] *$C^\Gamma_{A_1}$ and $C^\Gamma_{A_2}$ agree if and only if there exists a gauge equivalence that is the identity at the boundary, which pulls back A_2 to A_1.*

This particular setting is interesting, because of the existence of the "Euclidean direction" in our manifold, i.e. the direction set out by $\mathbb{R}$; this enables us to define a Carleman

[1] In this setting, given a connection 1-form A and a subset $\Gamma \subset \partial M$ of the boundary, the partial Cauchy data space are defined as $C^\Gamma_A = \{(u|_{\partial M}, d_A u(\nu)|_\Gamma) \big| d^*_A d_A u = 0 \text{ and } u \in H^1(M)\}$, where ν is the outward normal. See Section 2 for a more general definition.



Figure 1: Solid torus as a CTA manifold, showing front (green) and back (red) faces.

weight $\varphi(x) = x_1$, which in turn allows for the CGO solutions to be constructed (see [10]; for an alternative construction of the CGOs using the Fourier transform in the x_1 variable, see [24]). Our construction is based on the solutions known as "Gaussian beams", which have already shown to be fertile in the less complicated case of the operator $\Delta + q$ in [11]. We have successfully adapted the construction to the case of the connection Laplacian, valid for vector valued functions, too; the idea is to show existence of solutions which concentrate in a suitable way around geodesics and moreover, which also approximately solve the desired equation. This is done locally in Fermi charts covering the geodesic and then glued together to form a global solution. Moreover, it is worth emphasising that our main result Theorem 1.3 generalises the one present in [10], in that it *does not ask for* M_0 *to be simple*[2], which complicates the CGO construction significantly – more concretely, it allows for the geodesics on M_0 to self-intersect and allows for the existence of *conjugate points* (which prevent the exponential map from being a diffeomorphism).

Furthermore, in Section 6 another approach based on the interplay between the parallel transport and the unique continuation principle (UCP) for elliptic equations is pursued. Theorem 6.3 proves the Conjecture 1.1 in the setting of partial data, in the case of two flat connections. The latter assumption simplifies the problem significantly, because the parallel transport along homotopic curves is then the same, which enables us to define a suitable gauge. A similar idea was already used in [13] in the case of line bundles over surfaces. Moreover, there is a natural way of pushing these results further to the case of Yang-Mills connections (the ones that are important in physics); this will be considered in a forthcoming paper, in which we also prove boundary determination for connections and potentials for general vector bundles (that is, the restriction of the connection to the boundary is determined from the DN map – see Section 8 in [10] for the case of line bundles).

In addition to the above, we also provide a general framework and base for the future work in the direction of the Calderón problem for connections on vector bundles, by constructing the CGOs in general (see Theorem 5.4 and Remark 5.8) and getting to

[2]Simple manifolds are those for which the geodesics from every point parametrise the manifold, or more formally the exponential map is a diffeomorphism from its domain of definition; in addition, one also asks that the boundary is strictly convex (second fundamental form positive definite). The following implication holds: M_0 simple $\Rightarrow$ injectivity of the ray transform (see [15] for a short survey).

the fourth step in our previous analysis – for now, we only considered in detail the case of simple transversal manifolds – see Section 4. Moreover, in this case, one can reduce the main DN inverse problem to a *new non-abelian X-ray transform* – see Question 4.11, which we have not found in the literature. The reduction process is fully explained and outlined in Section 4.5. One distinct feature of this transform is that it involves the complex derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iX$, rather than just the usual geodesic vector field derivative X – hence, one could expect that methods from complex analysis and geometry might be useful to deduce certain properties of this transform (as in [7]). Another characteristic property of this transform is that it is not abelian in general, making it harder to reduce to an X-ray transform on just M_0, which is usually done in such situations (see [10]).

In order to support our Theorem 1.3, let us list a number of results that generate a large class of non-trivial examples for which our theorem is new. Firstly, the results of Stefanov, Uhlmann and Vasy [28, 25] give the injectivity of the ray transform if the manifold is foliated by convex hypersurfaces; secondly, the result of Guillarmou in [14] proves the injectivity in the case of manifolds with negative curvature and strictly convex boundary (second fundamental form positive). Finally, the very recent results of Paternain, Salo, Uhlmann and Zhou [23] show that the geodesic transform is injective in the case of strictly convex manifolds with non-negative sectional curvature. The second one of these results allows existence of trapping (geodesics of infinite length), while the third one allows for the existence of conjugate points. As a concrete example of where our Main Theorem is a new result, we can let the transversal manifold M_0 be a catenoid – a surface with negative curvature and for which the boundary is strictly convex; it has geodesics that are trapped (e.g. the middle circle) and hence is not simple, but the ray transform is injective by the results in [14].

The paper is organised as follows: in the next section we provide some elementary background and also prove an integral identity based on integration by parts, while Sections 3 and 5 are the most technical ones – in the former one we prove the necessary Carleman estimates for sections of vector bundles using semiclassical calculus. The latter one we divide into two parts: in the first part, we present the lengthy construction of the version of Gaussian beam solutions that is relevant for us, for general vector bundles; in the second one, we apply this construction to deduce the existence of CGO solutions and moreover, we prove that we may recover the differential of the connection dA from the DN map in the case of line bundles. However, before that in Section 4 we consider the case where the transversal manifold is simple and for which we may construct the ansatz in a much easier way – we conclude with a reduction to a new ray transform. Finally, the last section considers the case of two flat connections and finishes the proof of the main theorem.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to express his gratitude for the support of his supervisor, Gabriel Paternain and also to Trinity College for financial support. Furthermore, he would also like to acknowledge the very useful conversations with Mikko Salo, especially in regard to the contents of the third section of the paper.

2 Preliminaries and the identity

Throughout this section, (M, g) is a compact connected Riemannian manifold of dimension n with boundary, E is a Hermitian vector bundle of rank m over M, equipped with a unitary connection ∇. We also fix a matrix valued potential Q, that is a section of the endomorphism bundle of E. Moreover, we will denote the sections of E by $C^\infty(M; E)$ or by $\Gamma(E)$ (both notations are standard). The connection gives rise to a covariant deriva-

tive $\nabla : \Gamma(E) \to \Gamma(E \otimes T^*M)$; moreover, in a trivial vector bundle $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with the standard Hermitian inner product in the fibers, a unitary connection is given by a skew-Hermitian $m \times m$ matrix of one-forms A and the covariant derivative by $d_A = d + A$. We will interchangeably use the following symbols for the covariant derivative: d_A, ∇_A and ∇ (subscript A denotes the connection). Furthermore, we will assume the summation convention, where repeated indices mean that we sum over the corresponding index. All manifolds in this paper are assumed to be orientable.

The covariant derivative being unitary, means the following compatibility condition: $d\langle u, v\rangle_E = \langle \nabla u, v\rangle_E + \langle u, \nabla v\rangle_E$. We can use the Hermitian inner product to define inner product on sections of E:

$$(u, v)_{L^2(M;E)} = \int_M \langle u, v\rangle_E dV$$

where dV is the volume form on M (sometimes omitted from the integrals for simplicity) and more generally on E-valued one forms (that is, sections of $C^\infty(M; E \otimes T^*M)$), where in local coordinates $\alpha = \alpha_i dx^i$ and $\beta = \beta_i dx^i$

$$(\alpha, \beta)_{L^2(M;E\otimes T^*M)} = \int_M g^{ij} \langle \alpha_i, \beta_j\rangle_E dV$$

Let ∇^* be the formal adjoint of the covariant derivative with respect to these inner products. We denote by ν the outward normal derivative to ∂M. Now using Stokes' theorem one can prove that the following identity holds (see [19]):

$$(\nabla^* u, v)_{L^2} - (u, \nabla v)_{L^2} = (\iota_\nu u, v)_{L^2(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})} \tag{2.1}$$

where u is an E-valued one form and v is a section of E.

Now we can define the *twisted* or the *connection Laplacian* as

$$\mathcal{L}_\nabla = \nabla^* \nabla$$

We also denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\nabla,Q} = \nabla^*\nabla + Q$ the corresponding Schrödinger operator and $\mathcal{L}_{g,\nabla,Q}$ when we want to emphasise the dependence on the metric. With the assumption that 0 is *not a Dirichlet eigenvalue* of $\mathcal{L}_{\nabla,Q}$ in M (so we have unique solvability of the Dirichlet problem), the DN map is defined as:

Definition 2.1. The *Dirichlet-to-Neumann map* or the *DN map* is defined as $\Lambda_{\nabla,Q} f = \iota_\nu \nabla u|_{\partial M}$, where u is the unique solution of the elliptic problem:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\nabla,Q} u = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u|_{\partial M} = f$$

where $f \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial M)$.

An alternative (not always equivalent) and a more general way of phrasing the equality of the DN maps is through the *Cauchy data spaces*. The full Cauchy data spaces are given by $C_{\nabla,Q} = \left\{ \left(u|_{\partial M}, \iota_\nu \nabla u|_{\partial M} \right) \middle| \mathcal{L}_{\nabla,Q} u = 0, u \in H^1(M) \right\}$. It is important to point out that in one of the cases that are important to us, that is when $Q = 0$, we automatically have that zero is not a Dirichlet eigenvalue of the operator $\mathcal{L}_\nabla$ and so the DN map is well defined.

The following identity will be used and is stated in [19]. For a connection A on a trivial bundle $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$, we may define $(A, \beta) = g^{ij} A_i \beta_j$ for β an E-valued one-form. One can easily check that $\nabla^* = d_A^* = d^* - (A, \cdot)$, where d^* is the adjoint of the ordinary differential. One can then get the expression:

Lemma 2.2. *If $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$, we have the following expansion for the twisted Laplacian, where $A = A_i dx^i$:*

$$\mathcal{L}_A u = \Delta u - 2(A, du) + (d^* A)u - (A, Au)$$

For clarity, here we take the Laplacian to be with a negative sign, i.e. $\Delta u = d^* du = -|g|^{-1/2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}(|g|^{1/2} g_{jk} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^k})$, so our operator is positive definite. Therefore, we can clearly identify the second, the first and the zero order terms in the connection Laplacian. If we let (A, Q) be a pair of a connection and a potential, we will sometimes use the notation of the pair (X, q) to denote the matrix vector field X and the matrix potential q such that:

$$d_A^* d_A + Q = \Delta + X + q \tag{2.2}$$

in local coordinates, or globally if the corresponding bundle is trivial. The relationship between (A, Q) and (X, q) is given by $X = -2g^{ij} A_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$ and $q(u) = d^* A - (A, Au) + Q(u)$.

The next lemma computes the adjoint of the DN map, where Q is in $\Gamma(\text{End } E)$:

Lemma 2.3. *The following identity holds (Q^* is the Hermitian conjugate):*

$$(\Lambda_{\nabla,Q} f, g)_{L^2(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})} = (f, \Lambda_{\nabla,Q^*} g)_{L^2(\partial M; E|_{\partial M})}$$

Proof. We drop the full notation of $L^2(M; E)$. This follows from (2.1) and, since we have:

$$-(Qu, v)_M - (\nabla u, \nabla v)_M = (\Lambda_{\nabla,Q} f, g)_{\partial M} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\nabla,Q} u = 0$ and $u|_{\partial M} = f$ and any v such that $v|_{\partial M} = g$. If we swap the order of f and g and use the fact that the inner product is Hermitian, along with v being the solution to $\mathcal{L}_{\nabla,Q^*} v = 0$ and $v|_{\partial M} = g$, we get:

$$-(Q^* v, u)_M - (\nabla v, \nabla u)_M = (\Lambda_{\nabla,Q^*} g, f)_{\partial M}$$

which after conjugation finishes the proof. □

Now we restrict our attention to the trivial vector bundle $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with the connection matrix A. We will use the notation $|A|^2 = g^{ij} A_i A_j$ – please note this is *not a norm*, but rather comes from the complex bilinear extension of the metric inner product and that it is endomorphism valued. Also, $(A_j)_{kl}$ will denote the kl^{th} entry of the matrix A_j given by the expansion $A = A_j dx^j$.

Theorem 2.4 (Main identity)**.** *The following identity holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}\big((\Lambda_{A,Q_A} - \Lambda_{B,Q_B}) f, g\big) = \Big(\big(Q_B - Q_A + |A|^2 - |B|^2\big)u, v\Big) \\ + \int g^{ij} \big((B - A)_j\big)_{kl} \left(u_l \frac{\partial \bar{v}_k}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial u_l}{\partial x^i} \bar{v}_k\right)\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Here we have $\mathcal{L}_{A,Q_A} u = 0$ with $u|_{\partial M} = f$ and $\mathcal{L}_{B,Q_B^*} v = 0$ with $v|_{\partial M} = g$. Equivalently, for $m = 1$ one can write this as:

$$\begin{aligned}\big((\Lambda_{A,q_A} - \Lambda_{B,Q_B}) f, g\big) = \Big(\big(Q_B - Q_A + |A|^2 - |B|^2\big)u, v\Big) \\ + \int \langle B - A, u d\bar{v} - \bar{v} du \rangle_g\end{aligned}$$

Proof. As above, we have:

$$(\Lambda_{A,Q_A} f, g)_{\partial M} = -(Q_A u, v)_M - (d_A u, d_A v)_M$$

and similarly, where u and v as in the statement:

$$\begin{aligned}(\Lambda_{B,Q_B} f, g)_{\partial M} &= (f, \Lambda_{A_B,Q_B^*} g)_{\partial M} \\ &= -(Q_B u, v)_M - (d_B u, d_B v)_M\end{aligned}$$

So we get by subtracting:

$$\big((\Lambda_{A,Q_A} - \Lambda_{B,Q_B}) f, g\big) = \big((Q_B - Q_A)u, v\big) + (d_B u, d_B v) - (d_A u, d_A v)$$

We have $(Au, Av)_{L^2} = -\big(|A|^2 u, v\big)_M$ and $(Bu, Bv)_{L^2} = -\big(|B|^2 u, v\big)_M$ and moreover:

$$\big(du, (B-A)v\big) + \big((B-A)u, dv\big) = \int_M g^{ij} \big((B-A)_i\big)_{kl} \left(u_l \frac{\partial \bar{v}_k}{\partial x^j} - \frac{\partial u_l}{\partial x^j} \bar{v}_k \right)$$

by the skew-Hermitian property, where u_l and v_k denote the components of the vectors u and v. By putting the pieces together, this finishes the proof. □

Let us now denote by $E' = M \times \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ the endomorphism bundle of E, carying the natural trace Hermitian inner product $\langle X, Y \rangle = \operatorname{tr}(XY^*)$. Then we can naturally let the $\mathcal{L}_{A,Q}$ operator act on matrices by matrix multiplication[3]; furthermore, one easily shows the similarly extended DN maps for A_1 and A_2 on E' obtained in this way agree if and only if the usual DN maps for A_1 and A_2 agree on E – one just notices that the first claim is the same as the second one applied to all of n column vectors. Therefore, we have a version of the previous identity for matrices, where by capital letter we denote a matrix instead of a vector (we will need it in Section 4.5):

Theorem 2.5 (The identity for matrices)**.**

$$\begin{aligned}\big((\Lambda_{A,Q_A} - \Lambda_{B,Q_B}) F, G\big) = &\Big(\big(Q_B - Q_A + |A|^2 - |B|^2\big)U, V\Big) \\ &+ \big(dV^*U - V^*dU, A - B\big) \quad (2.5)\end{aligned}$$

The last bracket can be rewritten as $\big(d(V^*U)U^2, A - B\big)$.

Proof. This is almost trivial from the previous theorem: just note that $\frac{\partial (V^* U^{-1})}{\partial x^j} = \big(\frac{\partial V^*}{\partial x^j} - V^* U^{-1} \frac{\partial U}{\partial x^j}\big) U^{-1}$ and plug this into the identity stated previously. Using the fact that $\operatorname{tr}(AB) = \operatorname{tr}(BA)$, we can now easily transform the expression into the required form. □

3 Carleman estimates

The purpose of this section is to prove the Carleman estimates for vector valued functions. The scalar case was covered in [10] and here we generalise this approach; it is expected that the vector case is true since the principal part of $d_A^* d_A$ is diagonal.

Firstly, let us briefly explain what are limiting Carleman weights (LCW). These are certain functions on open Riemannian manifolds that guarantee the positivity of

[3]Note $\mathcal{L}_{A,Q}$ is *not* the same as the connection Laplacian obtained from the standard induced connection $d_A U = dU + [A, U]$ on the endomorphism bundle.

the conjugated Laplacian operator $P_{0,\varphi} = e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}\Delta e^{-\frac{\varphi}{h}}$ and hence existence of solutions to equations as below. They were introduced in [16] for the Euclidean case and generalised to manifolds in [10]. They have a nice geometric characterisation: in [10] it is proved that the existence of a LCW is equivalent to existence of a unit parallel vector field on the manifold (a vector field V is parallel if $\nabla V = 0$, where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection). This vector field yields a Euclidean direction on the manifold – hence, for simplicity, we will often assume our manifold to be embedded in $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$, which admits the Carleman weight $\varphi(x) = x_1$. Recall also that one can use the same LCW for all manifolds in one conformal class.

In the text below, we denote by $H^1_{scl}(M;E)$ the semiclassical Sobolev space associated to the sections of the vector bundle E over M, equipped with a connection ∇, with the inner product:

$$\|u\|_{H^1_{scl}(M;E)} = \big(\|u\|_{L^2(M;E)} + h^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(M;E)}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and by $L^2(M;E)$ the inner product space with the norm defined in the previous section. We start by proving a warm-up a priori Carleman estimate which relates the H^1_{scl} and L^2 norm of a solution to $P_{0,\varphi}u = h^2 f$, by essentially using only elementary methods; later we will see, in order to obtain a H^1 solution, we have to shift the indices and prove the inequality for every H^s_{scl}, where $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let us introduce the setting in which the theorems will be proved. We will work on M, a compact manifold with boundary which is compactly contained in U, an open manifold admitting a Carleman weight φ; moreover, U is again contained in a closed manifold N, which is useful since then we do not have to worry about boundary conditions on N. We work on the trivial vector bundle $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$. We will use the notation C^∞_c for the space of functions of compact support.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a smooth matrix of vector fields on M and q a smooth matrix function on M (matrices are m by m). Then there exists a constant C, such that the following inequality holds for all $u \in C^\infty_c(M^{int};E)$ and all sufficiently small $h > 0$:*

$$\|e^{\varphi/h}u\|_{H^1_{scl}(M)} \leq Ch\|e^{\varphi/h}(\Delta + X + q)u\|_{L^2(M)} \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Firstly, notice we have invariance under conformal scaling, i.e. observe that we have the identity:

$$c^{\frac{n+2}{4}}(\Delta_g + X + q)u = (\Delta_{c^{-1}g} + cX + q_c)(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}u)$$

where $q_c = cq - \frac{n-2}{4}Xc + c^{\frac{n+2}{4}}\Delta(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}})$, by using the conformal properties of the Laplacian. From this we can easily deduce the invariance of the inequality under conformal scaling, because we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
h\|e^{\varphi/h}(\Delta + X + q)e^{-\varphi/h}u\|_{L^2(M)} &= h\|e^{\varphi/h}c^{-\frac{n+2}{4}}(\Delta_{c^{-1}g} + cX + q_c)e^{-\varphi/h}(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}u)\|_{L^2(M)} \\
\gtrsim \|c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}u\|_{H^1_{scl,c^{-1}g}} &= \|c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}u\|_{L^2} + h\Big(\int \langle d(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}u), d(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}u)\rangle\Big)^{1/2} \\
&\geq \min c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}\|u\|_{L^2} + h\|d(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}})u + c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}du\|_{L^2,c^{-1}g} \\
&\geq \min c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}\|u\|_{L^2} + h\min c^{\frac{n+2}{4}}\|du\|_{L^2,g} - h\max|d(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}})|_g\|u\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, for h small enough, we must have $\min c^{\frac{n-2}{4}} > h\max c|d(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}})|_g$, which shows the reduction step. We can now freely assume that $\nabla\varphi$ has unit norm, as conformal scalings

preserve the property of being a LCW. In other words we may assume that the function φ is a *distance function*, i.e. we have $|\nabla\varphi| = 1$ and $D^2\varphi = 0$, where D is the Levi-Civita covariant derivative (see Lemma 2.5 in [10]). [4]

Furthermore, we can reduce our inequality to the case $q = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} Ch\|e^{\varphi/h}(\Delta + X + q)e^{-\varphi/h}u\|_{L^2} &\geq Ch\|e^{\varphi/h}(\Delta + X)e^{-\varphi/h}u\|_{L^2} - Ch\|qu\|_{L^2} \\ &\geq \|u\|_{H^1_{scl}(M)} - Ch\max\|q\|\|u\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

As soon as h is small enough such that $Ch\max\|q\| < 1$, the right hand side is positive. Here we have denoted by $\|q\|$ the operator norm of q and the maximum is over all of M.

In this step we show the inequality under the additional assumption that $X = 0$. Recall the following identity, with the specific expansion we will make use of later:

$$P_{0,\varphi} = e^{\varphi/h}h^2\Delta_g e^{-\varphi/h} = \underbrace{h^2\Delta - |\nabla\varphi|^2}_{A} + \underbrace{2\langle\nabla\varphi, h\nabla\rangle - h\Delta\varphi}_{iB}$$

Hence, we can build the following estimates.

$$(P_{0,\varphi}v, v) = h^2(\Delta v, v) - (|\nabla\varphi|^2 v, v) + 2h(\langle\nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle, v) - h(\Delta\varphi v, v)$$

By using the fact that $\int\langle df, dg\rangle = (\Delta f, g)$ for f and g compactly supported, we get:

$$\|h\nabla v\|^2 = (P_{0,\varphi}v, v) + (|\nabla\varphi|^2 v, v) - 2h(\langle\nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle, v) + h(\Delta\varphi v, v)$$

Therefore, we finally have, using Cauchy-Schwartz and AM-GM:

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\nabla v\|^2 &\leq \|P_{0,\varphi}v\|\|v\| + \|v\|^2 + 2\|v\|\|h\nabla v\| + h|\sup\Delta\varphi|\|v\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\|P_{0,\varphi}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\|v\|^2 + \epsilon\|h\nabla v\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

So for some C_1 and sufficiently small ϵ:

$$\|h\nabla v\|^2 \leq \|P_{0,\varphi}v\|^2 + C_1\|v\|^2$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove $\|v\| \leq C_2 h^{-1}\|P_{0,\varphi}v\|$ for some C_2.

Now, we claim that in the above expansion of $P_{0,\varphi}$, the parts A and B are formally self-adjoint. The proof is not too hard, but we state it for completeness. The bilinear map $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ we use is complex bilinear; also, formal self-adjointness means $(P\varphi, \psi) = (\varphi, P\psi)$ for all smooth compactly supported functions φ and ψ. We have:

$$\big((h^2\Delta - |\nabla\varphi|^2)u, v\big) = \big(u, (h^2\Delta - |\nabla\varphi|^2)v\big)$$

for all $u, v \in C_c^\infty(M^{int})$ because φ is real and Δ is self-adjoint. Moreover, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(2\langle\nabla\varphi, h\nabla u\rangle, v\Big) &= 2h\Big(\langle\nabla\varphi, \nabla u\rangle, v\Big) = 2h\Big(\langle d\varphi, du\rangle, v\Big) = 2h\int\langle d\varphi, \bar{v}du\rangle \\ &= 2h\int\langle d\varphi, d(u\bar{v}) - ud\bar{v}\rangle = 2h\int\Delta\varphi u\bar{v} - 2h\Big(u, \langle\nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle\Big) \end{aligned}$$

[4] In [10] it is also proved that a distance function is also an LCW if and only if $\varphi(\exp_x v) = \varphi(x) + \langle\nabla\varphi(x), v\rangle$; in particular, this means that we have a lot of LCWs in the Euclidean spaces, by letting $\varphi(x) = \rho\cdot x$ for a vector ρ.

and $\Big(h\Delta\varphi u, v\Big) = h\Big(u, \Delta\varphi v\Big)$. Therefore, by combining the two results:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(2\langle\nabla\varphi, h\nabla u\rangle - h\Delta\varphi u, v\Big) &= 2h\Big(\Delta\varphi u, v\Big) - h\Big(\Delta\varphi u, v\Big) - 2h\Big(u, \langle\nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle\Big) \\ &= -\Big(u, (-h\Delta\varphi v + 2h\langle\nabla\varphi, \nabla v\rangle)\Big) = -\Big(u, iBv\Big)\end{aligned}$$

which finally implies that A and B are formally self-adjoint in the scalar case. An exact same proof works in the vector case, because the action of the Laplacian Δ extends diagonally to vector valued functions and the inner product $\langle u, v\rangle = \sum u_i\bar{v}_i$ splits nicely with respect to this action and so we can simply sum over components.

We will now make use of the following identity:

$$\|P_{0,\varphi}v\|^2 = (P_{0,\varphi}v, P_{0,\varphi}v) = \big((A+iB)v, (A+iB)v\big) = \|Av\|^2 + \|Bv\|^2 + (i[A,B]v, v)$$

The idea is to use the positivity of the principal symbol to deduce the positivity of the last term in the expression above. We first need to use a *convexification* argument (see [10]), where we slightly perturb φ by a convex function. Namely, we consider a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and the composition $\tilde{f} = f \circ \varphi$. Then we have:

- $P_{0,\tilde{f}} = \tilde{A} + i\tilde{B}$, according to the above decomposition.
- $\nabla(f \circ \varphi) = f' \circ \varphi \nabla\varphi$.
- $D^2(f\circ\varphi) = D(f'\circ\varphi d\varphi) = d(f'\circ\varphi)\otimes d\varphi + f'\circ\varphi D(d\varphi) = f''\circ\varphi d\varphi\otimes d\varphi + f'\circ\varphi D^2\varphi$, where we used the fact that φ is a distance function. [5]

Now we quote Lemma 2.3. from [10], which computes the Poisson bracket of the principal symbols of A and B, which are respectively denoted as a and b:

$$\{a, b\}(x, \xi) = 4D^2\varphi(\xi^\#, \xi^\#) + 4D^2\varphi(\nabla\varphi, \nabla\varphi)$$

where we have the expressions $a = |\xi|^2 - |d\varphi|^2 = |\xi^\#|^2 - |\nabla\varphi|^2$ and $b = 2\langle\nabla\varphi, \xi^\#\rangle$. We are using the $\alpha^\#$ notation for the unique elements of T_pM such that $\alpha(v) = \langle\alpha^\#, v\rangle$ for an element α of T_p^*M. With this notation, $a + ib = p_\varphi$ is the principal symbol of $P_{0,\varphi}$ in the semiclassical Weyl quantisation (c.f. [10]). Using the results of this lemma, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\{\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}\}(x, \xi) &= 4f''\circ\varphi\langle\nabla\varphi, \xi^\#\rangle^2 + 4f''\circ\varphi(f'\circ\varphi)^2|\nabla\varphi|^4 \\ &= 4f''\circ\varphi(f'\circ\varphi)^2 + \underbrace{(f''\circ\varphi)(f'\circ\varphi)^{-2}}_{\beta}\tilde{b}^2\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{b} = 2\langle d(f\circ\varphi), \xi\rangle = 2f'\circ\varphi\langle\nabla\varphi, \xi^\#\rangle$. So, we must have

$$i[\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}] = 4h(f''\circ\varphi)(f'\circ\varphi)^2 + h\tilde{B}\beta\tilde{B} + h^2R$$

where R is first order semiclassical differential operator. Now we pick f such that:

- $f(s) = s + \frac{h}{2\epsilon}s^2$, $f'(s) = 1 + \frac{h}{\epsilon}s$ and $f'' = \frac{h}{\epsilon}$.
- Take $1 \geq \epsilon_0 \geq \frac{h}{\epsilon} > 0$ small enough s.t. $f' > 1/2$ on $\varphi(M)$ (so $h \leq \epsilon\epsilon_0$, i.e. $\epsilon \geq \frac{h}{\epsilon_0}$) and denote $\varphi_\epsilon = f \circ \varphi$. One can check that R and β are uniformly bounded w.r.t. h and ϵ.

[5] Note that $D^2(f\circ\varphi) \in \Gamma(T^*M \otimes T^*M)$ and D a connection on T^*M, so we have $d\varphi \otimes d\varphi \neq 0$.

Namely, one has:

$$\Big(i[\tilde{A},\tilde{B}]v,v\Big) = \Big(4\frac{h^2}{\epsilon}(1+\frac{h}{\epsilon}s)^2 v + h\tilde{B}(\frac{h/\epsilon}{(1+\frac{h}{\epsilon}s)^2}\tilde{B}v),v\Big) + h^2\Big(Rv,v\Big)$$
$$\geq \frac{h^2}{\epsilon}\|v\|^2 - C_0 h\|\tilde{B}v\|^2 - C_0 h^2\|v\|_{H^1_{scl}}\|v\|_{L^2}$$

because $\|Rv\| \leq C_0\|v\|_{H^1_{scl}}$ and because coefficients of R are uniformly bounded. All this holds for vector functions, as $[\tilde{A},\tilde{B}]$ acts diagonally, so $\Big(i[\tilde{A},\tilde{B}]v|v\Big)_{L^2_{vec}} = \sum\Big(i[\tilde{A},\tilde{B}]v_j|v_j\Big)_{L^2}$.

Using the inequality $\|h\nabla v\|^2 \leq \|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}\|^2 + C_1\|v\|^2$, we conclude:

$$\Big(i[\tilde{A},\tilde{B}]v|v\Big) \geq \frac{h^2}{\epsilon}(1-C_4\epsilon)\|v\|^2 - C_3 h\|\tilde{B}v\|^2 - C_3\|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}\|^2 \tag{3.2}$$

by employing $\|v\|_{H^1_{scl}} \leq \|v\|_{L^2} + \|h\nabla v\|_{L^2} \leq \text{const}\cdot\|v\|_{L^2} + \|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}\|_{L^2}$ and AM-GM. Hence, we finally get the inequality:

$$(1+C_3)\|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}v\|^2 \geq \|\tilde{A}v\|^2 + (1-C_3h)\|\tilde{B}v\|^2 + \frac{h^2}{\epsilon}(1-C_4\epsilon)\|v\|^2 \tag{3.3}$$

Let us now turn to the case $X \neq 0$ – we want to incorporate it into the inequality (3.3) and to estimate it in a suitable way. Note that we have $h^2 X_{\varphi_\epsilon} = he^{\varphi_\epsilon/h}Xe^{-\varphi_\epsilon/h} = h^2X - hf'\circ\varphi X\varphi$. Thus we have:

- $\|h^2 Xv\|_{L^2} = \|h^2\langle X,\nabla v\rangle\|_{L^2} \leq h|X|_{L^\infty,g}\|h\nabla v\|_{L^2} \leq \text{const}\cdot h\|v\|_{H^1_{scl}}$
- $hf'\circ\varphi X\varphi = h(1+\frac{h}{\epsilon}s)X\varphi$. Therefore we have $\|h(1+\frac{h}{\epsilon}s)X\varphi v\|_{L^2} = h(1+\frac{h}{\epsilon})\|X(\varphi)v\|_{L^2} \leq h(1+\frac{h}{\epsilon}s)\|X(\varphi)\|_{L^\infty}\|v\|_{L^2} \leq \text{const}\cdot h\|v\|_{L^2}$

By combining the two inequalities above, we conclude, by using (3.2):

$$\|h^2 X_{\varphi_\epsilon}\| \leq \text{const}\cdot h\|v\|_{H^1_{scl}} \lesssim h(\|v\|_{L^2} + \|P_{0,\varphi}v\|_{L^2})$$

which in turn implies the following chain of inequalities:

$$2(1+C_3)\|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}v + h^2X_{\varphi_\epsilon}v\|^2 \geq \frac{4}{3}(1+C_3)\|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}v\|^2 - C_5 h\Big(\|v\|^2 + \|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}\|^2\Big)$$
$$\geq \|v\|^2\Big(\frac{h^2}{\epsilon}(1-C_6\epsilon)\Big)$$

where $C_6 = C_4 + C_5$. So for ϵ small enough, there exists C_7 such that:

$$C_7\|P_{0,\varphi_\epsilon}v + h^2X_{\varphi_\epsilon}v\|^2 \geq \frac{h^2}{\epsilon}\|v\|^2 \tag{3.4}$$

Therefore we have for $u = e^{-\varphi_\epsilon/h}v$:

$$C_\epsilon h^2\|e^{\frac{\varphi^2}{2\epsilon}}e^{\frac{\varphi}{\epsilon}}(\Delta+X)u\|^2 \geq \|e^{\frac{\varphi^2}{2\epsilon}}e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}u\|^2$$

which together with $1 \leq e^{\frac{\varphi^2}{2\epsilon}} \leq$ constant, finally implies the result. □

Remark 3.2. (Carleman estimates with a boundary term.) We record an easy corollary of the above inequality for functions not necessarily supported in the interior of our manifold. Let $v \in C^\infty(M;\mathbb{C}^n) \cap H^1_0(M;\mathbb{C}^n)$ – then the following inequality holds:

$$\|v\|^2_{H^1_{scl}} \lesssim h^2 \|e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}(\Delta + X + Q)e^{-\frac{\varphi}{h}}v\|^2 + h(\partial_\nu\varphi\partial_\nu v, \partial_\nu v)_{\partial M}$$

This is an exercise in partial integration and using the condition that $v|_{\partial M} = 0$ to get rid of the extra factors. Namely, what we get in the above notation is:

$$\begin{aligned}\|(A+iB)v\|^2 &= \|Av\|^2 + \|Bv\|^2 + i(Bv, Av) - i(Av, Bv)\\ &= \|Av\|^2 + \|Bv\|^2 + i([A,B]v, v) - 2h^3(\partial_\nu\varphi\partial_\nu v, \partial_\nu v)|_{\partial M}\end{aligned}$$

by using $(ABv, v) - (Bv, Av) = -2ih^3(\partial_\nu\varphi\partial_\nu v, \partial_\nu v)|_{\partial M}$ and $(Bu, v) = (u, Bv)$ since v vanishes at the boundary. For the proof of the first equality we use the Green's identity and for the second, we use the formula (2.1). The proof then proceeds exactly the same way as before, by bounding the extra X factor in the equation and using the positivity of $i([A,B]v, v)$.

Now we turn to the proof of an inequality similar to the above one, but with shifted indices of the Sobolev spaces, which is actually necessary to obtain the wanted solvability estimates. This is done using the semiclassical pesudo-differential calculus.

Before we start, let us briefly introduce the Sobolev spaces for a real parameter, in a coordinate invariant way. This is described in more detail in [2]. It is a known fact that the Laplace operator on a complete Riemannian manifold is essentially self-adjoint on the dense subspace $C^\infty(N;E) \subset L^2(N;E)$ (see e.g. [26]). Then by applying the spectral theorem for unbounded densely defined operators, we can define the semiclassical Bessel potentials $J^s = (1-h^2\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The functional calculus from the spectral theorem also gives us that $J^sJ^t = J^{s+t}$ and the J^s commute with any function of the Laplacian Δ. Finally, we define the semiclassical Sobolev spaces H^s_{scl} as the completion of the $C^\infty(N;E)$ in the norm given by:

$$\|u\|_{H^s_{scl}(N;E)} = \|J^s u\|_{L^2(N;E)}$$

One can easily check that the dual of $H^s_{scl}(N;E)$ may be isometrically identified with the $H^{-s}_{scl}(N;E)$. Now, following [10], we have the following commutator estimates for vector valued functions; ψ, $\chi \in C^\infty_c(N)$ with $\chi = 1$ near $\mathrm{supp}\psi$ and $s, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $K \in \mathbb{N}$, then:

$$\|(1-\chi)J^s(\psi u)\|_{H^\alpha_{scl}(N;E)} \leq C_K h^K \|u\|_{H^\beta_{scl}(N;E)} \tag{3.5}$$

$$\|[D, J^s]u\|_{L^2(N;E)} \leq Ch\|u\|_{H^s_{scl}(N;E)} \tag{3.6}$$

where D is a first order semiclassical differential operator in N with diagonal principal part (the inequality does not hold without this assumption).

We are now ready to state the main two results of the section: they are left without a proof, since they both formally follow from the scalar considerations in Section 4 of [10], together with the proven vector inequalities above; also note that the operator splits as: $h^2e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}}(\Delta + X + q)e^{-\frac{\varphi}{h}} = h^2X + h^2q + P$, where P is a semiclassical operator. Also note that P acts diagonally, with principal part equal to $h^2\Delta$, which commutes with J^s and hence we may apply the above commutator estimate to it – the extra factors $h^2X + h^2q$ satisfy the required bounds because of the extra h factor.

Theorem 3.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 and given $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist constants C_s and h_s such that for all $0 < h \leq h_s$ and $u \in C_c^\infty(M^{int}; E)$:*

$$\|e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}} u\|_{H^{s+1}_{scl}(N;E)} \leq C_s h \|e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}} (\Delta + X + q)u\|_{H^s_{scl}(N;E)}$$

Essentially the only case that we will use in the previous theorem is the case $s = -1$; it appears that it is necessary in the following result, to establish the existence of an H^1 solution to our equation with a suitable norm estimate (otherwise, with Theorem 3.1 we would only get solutions in L^2 with bounds in H^{-1} norm).

Theorem 3.4. *Given a smooth connection matrix of 1-forms A and Q a smooth matrix potential, there exists a positive constant h_0 such that for any $0 < h \leq h_0$ and any section $f \in L^2(M; E)$, there exists a solution $u \in H^1(M; E)$ to the equation $e^{\frac{\varphi}{h}} \mathcal{L}_{g,A,Q} e^{-\frac{\varphi}{h}} u = f$ satisfying:*

$$\|u\|_{H^1_{scl}(M;E)} \leq Ch \|f\|_{L^2(M;E)}$$

4 The CGO construction for the case of simple manifolds

Now we consider the special solutions to the connection Laplacian problem, called complex geometrical optics (CGO) solutions. These are solutions of the form $e^{-\frac{\Psi}{h}}(a + r)$, where we think of the part with a as an "approximate solution" and r as a "correction term" (see [10] and references therein). We use the notation from the previous section, i.e. $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$ is a trivial vector bundle with the standard fibrewise Hermitian inner product, A a unitary connection on it and Q a matrix potential (section of the End$E$).

Our working assumption will be that M is isometrically embedded inside the manifold of the same dimension $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$, with the product metric $g = e \oplus g_0$. We start with an identity which will be useful for identifying different parts of the CGO solution:

Lemma 4.1. *The following identity holds, for $s \in \mathbb{C}$, ρ a smooth function, u a smooth vector valued function, X a smooth matrix vector field and q a smooth matrix potential:*

$$e^{-s\rho}\Big(\Delta + X + q\Big)e^{s\rho}u = (\Delta + X + q)u + s\Big((\Delta\rho)u + X(\rho)u - 2\langle\nabla\rho, \nabla(u)\rangle\Big) - s^2|d\rho|^2 u$$

Now plugging in the specific form of solution as above $u = e^{-\frac{\Psi}{h}}(a+r)$ to the equation $\mathcal{L}_{A,Q}u = 0$ (a and r are $\mathbb{C}^m$-valued) and using the Lemma 4.1, we get three equations:

$$|d\Psi|^2 = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

$$-2\langle d\Psi, da\rangle + (\Delta\Psi)a + X(\Psi)a = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

$$e^{\frac{\Psi}{h}} \mathcal{L}_{A,q} e^{-\frac{\Psi}{h}} r = -\mathcal{L}_{A,q} a \tag{4.3}$$

where the first two of the them correspond to the dominating factors (the coefficients next to h^0 and h^1, respectively) when $h \to 0$ and the last one makes sure we get an exact solution and solves for the residue. The notation $\langle d\Psi, da\rangle$ means that we consider the vector formed by taking the inner product of each component of da with $d\Psi$ and X was defined in (2.2) from the pair (A, Q).

In what follows, we will make the assumption that the manifold M_0 is *simple*, that is the exponential map $\exp_p : \exp_p^{-1}(M_0) \to M_0$ is a diffeomorphism for every point $p \in M_0$ and the boundary ∂M is strictly convex. We will be making this assumption despite the fact we will be able later to construct the CGO in the more general case (see Section 5), because it is important to build our intuition for the vector case in the less complicated example of a simple manifold.

4.1 Eikonal equation

This is the equation (4.1) above. Note that in this case the operation $|\cdot|$ we used to write down this equation is just a complex bilinear form obtained by extending the Riemannian real inner product. Thus, if we write $\Psi = \varphi + i\psi$, the equation can be rewritten as:

$$|\nabla\psi|^2 = |\nabla\varphi|^2, \quad \langle\nabla\psi, \nabla\varphi\rangle = 0 \tag{4.4}$$

Here we let φ to be a Limiting Carleman Weight given by $\varphi(x) = x_1$. With this special choice for φ, our equations become simple:

$$|\nabla\psi| = 1, \quad \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x_1} = 0 \tag{4.5}$$

because of the splitting of the metric in $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$. Here we will fix a polar coordinate system: we will pick a point $\omega \in M_0$ such that (x_1, ω) is not in M for any x_1. We can always do this given that we enlarge M_0 a bit at the beginning, keeping the metric simple (see [10]), to some manifold D such that:

$$(M, g) \Subset (\mathbb{R} \times M_0, g) \Subset (\mathbb{R} \times D, g)$$

We then use the geodesic polar coordinate system at this point to get a coordinate chart (x_1, r, θ), where $\theta \in S^{n-2}$ to cover M, in which the metric has a nice form to construct a particular solution.

One can then check that $\psi = r$ and $\Psi = x_1 + ir$ solves (4.5) (note that the solution depends on ω). It is very useful to observe, at this point, that we could have chosen $\varphi = -x_1$ and so $\Psi = -x_1 + ir$ to work equally well. This will be handy when we plug in the solutions in our identity, so that the exponential parts cancel.

4.2 Transport equation

This is the equation (4.2). We now proceed to the calculation of the three terms in this equation – the solution to the eikonal that we first consider is $\Psi = x_1 + ir$. We get the expressions:

$$\langle d\Psi, da\rangle = \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x_1}\frac{\partial a}{\partial x_1} + \sum_{j,k\geq 2} g^{jk}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x^j}\frac{\partial a}{\partial x^k} = \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big)a$$

$$\Delta\Psi = -|g|^{-1/2}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}(|g|^{1/2}) + \sum_{j,k\geq 2}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\big(|g|^{1/2}g^{jk}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x^k}\big)\Big) = -|g|^{-1/2}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big)(|g|^{1/2})$$

$$X(\Psi) = -2\Big(A_1 + 2\sum_{j,k\geq 2} g^{jk}A_j\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}(x_1 + ir)\Big) = -2(A_1 + iA_r)$$

where A_1 and A_r are the dx_1 and dr components of A, respectively; note that the coordinates we are taking on M_0 are $(x^2, \dots x^n)$. If we write $z = x_1 + ir$, then we will denote the complex derivatives as $\bar\partial = \frac{\partial}{\partial\bar z} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big)$ and $\partial = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big)$. Then the equation (4.2) takes the form:

$$4\frac{\partial a}{\partial\bar z} + |g|^{-1/2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar z}\big(|g|^{1/2}\big)a + 2(A_1 + iA_r)a = 0 \tag{4.6}$$

By introducing an integrating factor and using the substitution $b = a|g|^{1/4}$, we get the following nicer form of the equation:

$$\frac{\partial b}{\partial\bar z} = -\frac{1}{2}(A_1 + iA_r)b \tag{4.7}$$

The counterpart of this equation, just using the other solution to the eikonal equation $\Psi = -x_1 + ir$ is the following one:

$$\frac{\partial b}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{2}(-A_1 + iA_r)b \tag{4.8}$$

We will focus on the equation (4.7) (note one gets the form of the latter equation by conjugating the former). We will consider a slightly more general equation, consisting of an m by m matrix $C(\theta, x_1, r)$. If we denote the matrix $B = -\frac{1}{2}(A_1 + iA_r)$, then this equation is:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial \bar{z}} = BC \tag{4.9}$$

with one additional condition: C is invertible in its domain of definition. Such a matrix C will play an important role in this paper. We will need the solution on an open bounded subset of the plane, depending smoothly on some parameters. However, if one considers this equation on the whole domain of $\mathbb{C}$, a natural boundary condition would be to have C approaching the identity at ∞; however this might be impossible – see [7] for the proof of existence of a C which has polynomial growth.

Whereas this equation can be solved (nowhere vanishing solution) in the $m = 1$ case by substituting the exponential function and then using the Cauchy operator to get a nowhere zero solution, for $m > 1$ this gets more complicated (invertible matrix solution). We give one proof of existence in the next subsection and a brief overview of other approaches. Then one solution of the transport equation is given by $a = Ch$, where h is holomorphic in each coordinate.

4.3 Complex geometric approach to the construction of the solution to transport equation

There is a geometric solution to the transport equation which has risen above. It uses some standard theory of holomorphic vector bundles – the references we have are the books by Kobayashi [18], Proposition 3.7 and Forster [12], Theorem 30.1. This solves the problem in an open subset of $\mathbb{C}$, which leaves us with the problem of smoothly gluing everything as we vary the parameter θ from before. We begin by citing these theorems:

Theorem 4.2. *Let E be a C^∞ complex vector bundle over a complex manifold M. Then if D is a connection on E such that $D'' \circ D'' = 0$, then there exists a unique holomorphic vector bundle structure on E such that $D'' = d''$.*

Theorem 4.3. *Let X be an open Riemann surface and E a holomorphic vector bundle over X, of dimension n. Then X is trivial, i.e. there exists a set of holomorphic sections s_i, $i = 1, \dots n$ such that they span E_p for each point p in X.*

In the theorem, by D'' we mean the $(0,1)$ component of the connection derivative and by d'' the $(0,1)$ component of the exterior derivative. With the help of these facts, we may solve our problem:

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be an open subset of the complex plane and let $E = \Omega \times \mathbb{C}^n$, together with a connection D. Then there exists a smoothly varying invertible matrix F such that $\bar{\partial} F = -FA_{0,1}$, where $A_{0,1}$ is the $(0,1)$ part of D. In particular, for any matrix B, there exists an invertible, smoothly varying matrix C such that $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \bar{z}} = BC$.*

Proof. The proof relies on the previous two theorems; namely, we automatically have $D'' \circ D'' = 0$ by dimension. Thus, there exists a holomorphic structure such that

$D'' = d''$. Although our vector bundle is smoothly trivial, we do not know if it is holomorphically trivial – this is given by Theorem 4.3. Thus, there exists a set of holomorphic trivialisations s_i, $i = 1, \dots n$ such that they are linearly independent at each point of Ω; in these new coordinates, we also have $D'' = d''$. In other words, there exists a smoothly (not necessarily holomorphically!) varying matrix $F : \Omega \to GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ such that, $s_i = Fe_i$, where e_i is our original, standard global frame of E. Then we have the change of basis law for connections:

$$0 = \bar{\partial} s_i = D'' s_i = D''(Fe_i) = \bar{\partial} F e_i + F D'' e_i = \bar{\partial} F e_i + F A_{0,1} e_i \tag{4.10}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus we finally get, in matrix form:

$$\bar{\partial} F = -F A_{0,1} \tag{4.11}$$

By picking the $(0,1)$ part of the connection to be B, and letting $C = F^{-1}$, we get $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \bar{z}} = BC$. □

Remark 4.5. We can actually have a smoothly trivial holomorphic vector bundle, but *not holomorphically* trivial – for an example, just take any non-zero element in the kernel of the surjection $\mathrm{Pic}(M) \to \mathbb{Z}$ given by the degree (first Chern class) of the line bundle, where M a closed surface of positive genus.

Recall that we want to solve (4.9), i.e. the equation $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \bar{z}} = BC$ where $C = C(z, \theta)$ is a function of $z = (x_1, r)$ and $\theta \in S^{n-2}$. However, in order to solve this equation, we need to go through the proof of trivialising the holomorphic vector bundle parametrically; we will not do this here, since there are already a few nice proofs of existence of such solutions.

Let us give a brief overview of proofs of existence of (invertible) solutions to the above equation we found in literature. As mentioned, Eskin [7] gives us C depending smoothly on a parameter, with polynomial growth as $|z| \to \infty$. A more concise proof is given by the same author and Ralston [8] – it relies on solving the equation locally using the Cauchy operator to transform it to an integral equation and then gluing things together using the Cartan's lemma. Finally, Nakamura and Uhlmann [21] also provide us with another method.

4.4 The inhomogeneous part

Here we deal with the third equation set out above, the equation (4.3). With the Carleman estimates established so far, we may easily construct the residue with the wanted estimates – we just use Theorem 3.4 to solve for r and the estimates clearly follow.

4.5 Consequences of the CGO construction and recovering the connection

Now will use the previously obtained CGO solutions to deduce some new information from the equality of the DN maps. Reducing to an X-ray transform or asking for injectivity of some other transform is often the way to finish off inverse problems: see [22, 10, 11, 4] for examples of such results for the X-ray transform or [9] for an example of the Radon transform on planes; this is the viewpoint we will take. We are in the usual setting: M is compactly contained in $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$, M_0 simple and $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$ equipped with potentials $Q_{1,2}$ and connections $A_{1,2}$. It is technically easier to consider matrix

solutions to $\mathcal{L}_{A_i,Q_i}U_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, constructed in the previous subsection, which are of the form:

$$U_1 = e^{-\frac{x_1+ir}{h}}\big(|g|^{-1/4}C_1H(x_1,r)b(\theta) + R_1\big)$$
$$U_2 = e^{-\frac{-x_1+ir}{h}}\big(|g|^{-1/4}C_2 + R_2\big)$$

where $R_i = O(h)$, H a holomorphic matrix and b is smooth. The invertible matrices C_i are given by solving the transport equations (4.7) and (4.8):

$$\frac{\partial C_1}{\partial \bar{z}} = -\frac{1}{2}((A_1)_1 + i(A_1)_r)C_1, \quad \frac{\partial C_2}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{2}(-(A_2)_1 + i(A_2)_r)C_2 \tag{4.12}$$

We wish to plug these in the identity obtained in Theorem 2.5. Note that we have:

$$dU_2^* = e^{\frac{x_1+ir}{h}}\Big(\frac{dx_1 + idr}{h}\big(|g|^{-\frac{1}{4}}C_2^* + R_2^*\big) + d(|g|^{-\frac{1}{4}}C_2^*) + d(R_2^*)\Big)$$

Therefore, in the limit $h \to 0$, for $\tilde{A} = A_2 - A_1$:

$$\lim_{h\to 0} h\big(dU_2^*U_1 - U_2^*dU_1, \tilde{A}\big) = -2\int_M \operatorname{tr}\big(|g|^{-\frac{1}{2}}C_2^*C_1Hb(\theta)(\tilde{A}_1 + i\tilde{A}_r)\big)dV_g$$

by using the bounds we have on the R_i, their derivatives and the fact that everything else is bounded. Moreover, since the A_is and Q_is are bounded, the first integral in the identity is $O(1)$, so in the limit, when multiplied by h is zero. Thus we get, assuming $\Lambda_{A_1,Q_1} = \Lambda_{A_2,Q_2}$ and by taking the limit $h \to 0$:

$$\int_M \operatorname{tr}\big(|g|^{-\frac{1}{2}}C_2^*C_1Hb(\theta)(\tilde{A}_1 + i\tilde{A}_r)\big)dV_g = 0 \tag{4.13}$$

where dV_g is the volume form. Since $dV_g = |g|^{1/2}dx_1drd\theta$ and since we can vary b so that it approximates the delta function, we obtain:

$$\int_{M_0^\theta} \operatorname{tr}\Big((\tilde{A}_1 + i\tilde{A}_r)C_2^*C_1H\Big)dz \wedge d\bar{z} = 0 \tag{4.14}$$

where $z = x_1 + ir$ and $M_0^\theta = [-N, N] \times M_0 \cap \{\theta = \text{const}\}$, for some large N (we also have $M^\theta = M \cap \{\theta = \text{const}\}$ is a 2-dimensional smooth manifold for almost all θ by Sard's theorem; the previous integral can be made over such M^θ, too), such that $[-N, N] \times M_0$ contains a neighbourhood of M.

Here, we extended the connections A_1 and A_2 to the outside of M (whole of $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$), such that they are unitary, compactly supported and most importantly, such that $A_1 = A_2$ outside M. This is allowed by the crucial argument of *boundary determination*, which gives us that the full jets of A_1 and A_2 are the same in suitable gauges, given that the corresponding DN maps agree. Therefore, if we apply the mentioned gauges to the connections before starting our analysis of the problem in this Section, we may extend A_1 in any way such that it is unitary and compactly supported in $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$ and then the previous discussion shows why the same extension works for A_2, thus proving $\tilde{A} = 0$ outside M. The boundary determination result is proved for line bundles in [10] – for completeness, we will now give the exact formulation of the result we need for the case of bundles with $m \geq 2$:

Theorem 4.6. *Let (M, g) be a compact manifold with boundary and $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$ a Hermitian vector bundle equipped with two unitary connections A_1 and A_2. Suppose that the corresponding DN maps Λ_{A_1} and Λ_{A_2} are the same: then there exist gauges F_1 and F_2 that are equal to the identity at the boundary, such that $F_1^*(A_1)$ and $F_2^*(A_2)$ have the same Taylor series in the boundary normal coordinates on all of ∂M.*

Moreover, the gauge transformations F_1 and F_2 in Theorem 4.6 may be taken from Lemma 6.2, such that in these gauges we have normal components of both $F_1^*(A_1)$ and $F_2^*(A_2)$ vanishing near the boundary. This result is a corollary of a slightly more general boundary determination result, which involves two distinct matrix potentials and two distinct metrics and is proved in a forthcoming paper.

Now, by using the equations (4.12), we get:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}\big(C_2^* C_1\big) = \frac{1}{2} C_2^*(\tilde{A}_1 + i\tilde{A}_r) C_1 \tag{4.15}$$

where we also used that A_is are skew-Hermitian. This implies that, along with the fact the above holds for all holomorphic H, in particular all constant H:

$$\int_{M_0^\theta} H \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}\big(C_2^* C_1\big) dz \wedge d\bar{z} = 0 \tag{4.16}$$

and therefore by Stokes' theorem, we get:

$$\int_{\partial M_0^\theta} H C_2^* C_1 dz = 0 \tag{4.17}$$

where H is any holomorphic matrix, i.e. $\frac{\partial H}{\partial \bar{z}} = 0$. Note that we may permute the order of C_1 and C_2 if we want, by taking the trace and using the same argument again.

In the case of $m = 1$, the results in [10] already solve the Conjecture 1.1 – we would now like to deduce a suitable transport equation on $\mathbb{R} \times SM_0$ which also applies to the case $m \geq 2$ and to try to solve the problem from there.



FIGURE 2: The construction of the matrix function $G(x_1, x, v)$: we are following the geodesic γ at (x_1, x) in the direction $-v$ up to the point (x_1, p) on ∂D. The angle θ denotes the polar coordinate of the point x with centre at p; distance between x and p is r.

Recall from Section 4.1 of the enlarged simple manifold D, which contains M_0. Then as we go along ∂D and follow the tangent vectors, we obtain families of geodesics on our M_0. Let us denote by $C_1(p, \theta, x_1, r)$ and $C_2(p, \theta, x_1, r)$ the solutions to the

equations (4.12), where p denotes the point of the origin of the polar coordinate system; as explained previously in Section 4.3, it is a fact that we may construct solutions to (4.12) depending smoothly on a parameter, giving C_1 and C_2 smooth as we vary (p, θ, x_1, r). Now given any $(x_1, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times M_0$ and $v \in S_x M_0$ a unit tangent vector, we may trace backwards the geodesic starting at (x_1, x) with speed v (or go forwards in time with the geodesic with speed $-v$), until we hit ∂D; call this point (x_1, p) – see Figure 2. Define $G(x_1, x, v) = C_1(p, \theta, x_1, r)C_2^*(p, \theta, x_1, r)$, where r is the length of the described geodesic from (x_1, p) to (x_1, x), θ is the coordinate of (x_1, x) in the polar coordinate system; since the arguments of C_i depend on parameters smoothly, so do C_is and therefore G, too. Therefore, we obtain a smooth matrix function G on $\mathbb{R} \times SM_0$, where SM_0 denotes the unit sphere bundle. By previous analysis, we have an equation for G:

$$2\frac{\partial G}{\partial \bar{z}} = -\big((A_1)_1 + i(A_1)_r\big)G + G\big((A_2)_1 + i(A_2)_r\big)$$

on the planes which are generated by the x_1 direction and a geodesic, i.e. by setting θ to be constant for a given $p \in \partial D$. From the previous equation we easily deduce that we have globally:

$$\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iX(x, v)\big)G = -A_1\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iv\big)G + GA_2\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iv\big) \tag{4.18}$$

for all $x \in M_0$, v unit tangent vectors in M_0 and $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$; $X(x, v)$ is the geodesic vector field on SM_0. For all further purposes, let us make a shorthand notation for the vector field $\mathbb{X}(x_1, x, v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iX(x, v)$.

First of all, let us see what information does our integral equation (4.17) give us. We will need the following standard result:

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a domain with smooth boundary and let f be a smooth function on $\partial\Omega$. Then f is a restriction of a holomorphic function h on Ω, i.e. $f = h|_\Omega$ if and only if*

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} g(z)f(z)dz = 0$$

for all holomorphic functions g on Ω, which have a continuous extension to $\bar{\Omega}$.

The proof of this Lemma uses the Plemelj-Sokhotski-Privalov formula and it follows from the proof of Lemma 5.1 in [9]. As an application of this result, we have:

Lemma 4.8. *There exists a holomorphic, invertible matrix function F on M_0^θ, such that $F^{-1}|_{\partial M_0^\theta} = C_2^* C_1|_{\partial M_0^\theta}$.*

Proof. By applying the Lemma 4.7 to the equation 4.17, we deduce there exists a holomorphic matrix function F', such that $F'|_{\partial M_0^\theta} = C_2^* C_1|_{\partial M_0^\theta}$. We need to prove F' is invertible on M_0^θ.

Firstly, $M_0^\theta = [-N, N] \times [0, L]$ in local coordinates (L is the length of the segment of the unit speed geodesic starting at a point $p \in \partial D$, which lies in M_0), which is simply-connected. Therefore, since $\det(C_1) \neq 0$ on M_0^θ, it is standard that $\det(C_1)$ admits a logarithm: we have a smooth function Φ_1 on M_0^θ such that $\det(C_1) = e^{\Phi_1}$, and similarly we have Φ_2 such that $\det(C_2) = e^{\Phi_2}$. From this, we infer that the variation of the argument of $\det(F')|_{\partial M_0^\theta} = e^{\Phi_1 + \bar{\Phi}_2}|_{\partial M_0^\theta}$ is zero, since Φ_1 and Φ_2 are proper functions. Therefore, by the argument principle applied on the holomorphic function $\det(F')$, we conclude F' is invertible on the whole of M_0^θ. By setting $F = (F')^{-1}$, we are done.[6] □

[6]Moreover, one can show that $\frac{\partial \Phi_1}{\partial \bar{z}} = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr}\big((A_1)_1 + i(A_1)_r\big)$ and $\frac{\partial \bar{\Phi}_2}{\partial \bar{z}} = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr}\big((A_2)_1 + i(A_2)_r\big)$, but we will not need this here.

More generally, we have such F depending smoothly on the parameters θ and $p \in \partial D$ and so we obtain a smooth matrix function F on $[-N,N] \times SM_0$[7] such that $F|_{[-N,N]\times\partial SM_0} = (C_2^* C_1)|_{[-N,N]\times\partial SM_0}$ and $\mathbb{X}(F) = 0$. Then we can redefine the solution C_2 to equations (4.12) (parametrised by $p \in D$ and θ), by setting $C_2' = C_2 F^*$ – the transport equations will be satisfied again, but more importantly, we must have (4.18) fulfilled with the new $G'(x_1, x, v) = C_1(p, \theta, x_1, r)(C_2')^*(p, \theta, x_1, r)$ defined analogously as before and:

$$G'|_{[-N,N]\times\partial SM_0} = (C_1 C_2'^*)|_{[-N,N]\times\partial SM_0} = (C_1 F C_2^*)|_{[-N,N]\times\partial SM_0} = Id|_{[-N,N]\times\partial SM_0}$$

by the definition of F. Let us relabel the G' back to G. Furthermore, in this setting, we have the following:

Lemma 4.9. *We have $G(x_1, x, v)$ equal to the identity for $(x_1, x) \in [-N, N] \times M_0 \setminus M$ and $v \in S_x M_0$.*

Proof. Let us fix a point $p \in \partial D$ and the polar coordinate $\theta \in S^{n-2}$. We have that $\tilde{A} = 0$ outside M^θ and it would suffice to show $G = Id$ on $M_0^\theta \setminus M^\theta$. The equation (4.12) becomes in $M_0^\theta \setminus M^\theta$:

$$2\frac{\partial G}{\partial \bar{z}} = [G, (A_1)_1 + i(A_1)_r]$$

and thus we also have $2\frac{\partial G''}{\partial \bar{z}} = [G'', (A_1)_1 + i(A_1)_r]$, where $G'' = G - Id$, with $G''|_{\partial M_0^\theta}$. Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}$ is an elliptic operator and the previous equation is a linear one, we may apply the unique continuity theorem for linear elliptic first order systems (see [3] for a precise statement) and conclude that $G''(x_1, x, v) = 0$ for $(x_1, x) \notin M$ and $v \in S_x M_0$, since $G'' = 0$ on a codimension one set, thus proving the claim. □

Therefore, in particular $G'(x_1, x, v) = Id$ for $(x_1, x) \in \partial M$ and $v \in S_x M_0$, by the previous lemma.

Often, the crux of the matter in the X-ray injectivity problems is to prove the independence of the gauge of the velocity variable; the only difference here from the usual problem is that we have a complex derivative $\mathbb{X}$, instead of the usual geodesic vector field X. Indeed, we have:

Lemma 4.10. *If the solution of* (4.18) *is independent of the velocity variable, then G is the wanted gauge equivalence between A_1 and A_2 on E, with $G|_{\partial M} = Id$, thus proving the Conjecture 1.1.*

Proof. It is easy to show the following fact about the geodesic vector field: $X(x, v)f = df(v)$, when f is independent of the velocity variable. Therefore, we can write down two equations out of (4.18), one for v and the other for $-v$, respectively:

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial x_1} + idG(v) = -A_1\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\Big)G - iA_1(v)G + GA_2\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\Big) + iGA_2(v)$$
$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial x_1} - idG(v) = -A_1\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\Big)G + iA_1(v)G + GA_2\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\Big) - iGA_2(v)$$

by adding and subtracting the above equations, we easily get that $dG = -A_1 G + GA_2$ or equivalently $G^*(A_1) = G^{-1}dG + G^{-1}A_1 G = A_2$, which together with $G|_{\partial M} = Id$ finishes the proof. □

[7] The Plemelj-Sokhotski-Privalov formula actually gives $F^{-1}(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\partial M_0^\theta} \frac{C_2^*(\zeta)C_1(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta$.

Ideally we would like to reduce this to an ordinary X-ray injectivity problem on M_0 (technically, (4.18) would become an injectivity problem for $G - Id$, with the left hand side being $\tilde{A}^1 + i\tilde{A}^r$) in some process of excluding the x_1 variable. This is indeed possible for the line bundle case, which we will see at the end of the next section – it involves the procedure of taking the logarithm of G and applying the Fourier transform. Moreover, let us emphasise that all the information we obtained from the DN map through CGO solutions, we managed to pack into a single boundary condition: $G(x_1, x, v) = Id$ for $(x_1, x) \in \partial M$ and $v \in S_x M_0$. Finally, for complete clarity, let us state the main problem separately:

Question 4.11 (The non-abelian X-ray transform or Radon transform)**.** *Let (M_0, g_0) be a compact manifold with boundary, with $\dim M_0 \geq 2$ and let M be an isometrically embedded, compact submanifold of $T = (\mathbb{R} \times M_0, e \oplus g_0)$ with non-empty boundary and $\dim M = \dim T$. Let $E = \mathbb{R} \times M_0 \times \mathbb{C}^m$ be a Hermitian vector bundle equipped with two unitary connections A_1 and A_2, which are compactly supported and satisfy $A_1 = A_2$ on $\mathbb{R} \times M_0 \setminus M$. Let $R' = \{(x_1, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times SM_0 : (x_1, x) \notin M\}$. Assume we are given a smooth matrix function $G : \mathbb{R} \times SM_0 \to GL(m, \mathbb{C})$ such that, if $\mathbb{X} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iX$, where X is the geodesic vector field:*

$$\mathbb{X}G(x_1, x, v) = -A_1(x_1, x)\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iv\Big)G(x_1, x, v) + G(x_1, x, v)A_2(x_1, x)\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iv\Big)$$

for all (x_1, x, v), with the additional condition $G|_{R'} = Id$. Prove that G is independent of the velocity variable v.

However, we could have formulated the problem in a slightly more general way than this one: for example, we could have only asked that the equation is fulfilled on the smaller set $P = \{(x_1, x, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times SM_0 : (x_1, x) \in M\}$ with the boundary condition $G|_R = Id$, where $R = \{(x_1, x, v) \in P : (x_1, x) \in \partial M\}$.

Remark 4.12. There is a way of formulating Question 4.11 in a more compact way. Namely, one could define the unitary connection $\hat{A}(R) = A_1 R - R A_2$ on the endomorphism bundle of E to get the form of the equation to $\mathbb{X}G + \hat{A}\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + iv\big)G = 0$; then we may formulate the problem in terms of just a single connection.

Remark 4.13. If A_1 and A_2 are independent of the x_1 variable (on M) in the setting of Question 4.11, then we would have $A_1 \equiv A_2$ by the boundary condition and therefore $G \equiv Id$. In the harder version of the problem that was set out in the paragraph after Question 4.11, if the connections are independent of x_1, one can apply the Fourier transform in x_1 to reduce the problem to an attenuated transform on M_0.

Therefore, the problem is reduced to a new kind of a non-abelian X-ray transform – we leave it as one of the future projects to either further reduce the problem to an attenuated X-ray transform on M_0 or apply some other method to prove independence of the velocity variable directly. However, one thing is expected: methods from complex analysis and geometry could be useful to prove Question 4.11. This is supported by the work of Eskin (see Section 5 in [7]), where he proves Conjecture 1.1 in the Euclidean metric case, by "moving around" the x_1 direction, which can be interpreted as having the equations (4.12) for essentially all planes going through points in M. In short, by generating a holomorphic family of such planes, Eskin obtains that G is holomorphic with respect to this variable and hence constant by Liouville's theorem; such families are dense enough to guarantee G is constant in the vertical directions and hence independent of v. Unlike the Euclidean metric case, in our situation we have a fixed x_1 direction, so we may also expect a different approach to be used.

5 Gaussian Beams

In this section, we will construct the Gaussian Beam quasimodes (or generalised approximate eigenfunctions) that concentrate near geodesics, for the purposes of constructing the CGO solutions in the case where the transversal manifold is not necessarily simple. Moreover, we will use the method described in [11], where it was already used in the case of a scalar potential and no first order term – here we also consider the vector case and a first order term. More precisely, we consider CGO solutions of the form $e^{-sx_1}(v_s + r_s)$ for the general operator $\Delta + X + q$, where $s = \tau + i\lambda$ is complex, with τ and λ reals; we want to guarantee certain behaviour of the solutions in the limit as $\tau \to \infty$. At the end of this section, we will consider an application of this construction to the problem of determining the connection from the DN map. We start by motivating our definition:

- Since v_s is the main part of the solutions we would like to have $e^{sx_1}(\Delta + X + Q)e^{-sx_1}v_s$ small in L^2 norm.
- The solutions should concentrate along geodesics in a certain way.
- Simple manifold case: this is covered in Proposition 5.3 below and motivates the general transversal manifold case.

Throughout the section, we are working in the setting of $M \Subset (\mathbb{R} \times M_0, e \oplus g)$ with $\dim M_0 + 1 = \dim M = n \geq 3$.

Definition 5.1 (Quasimodes)**.** Given a family of functions v_s on M depending on a parameter $s = \tau + i\lambda$ ($\tau, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$), we say that v_s is a *generalised approximate eigenfunction* or *generalised quasimode* if $\|v_s\|_{L^2(M)} = O(1)$ as $\tau \to \infty$ and:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\Big((\Delta_g + X + q) + s(2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - X_1) - s^2\Big)v_s\right\|_{L^2(M)} &= \|e^{sx_1}(\Delta + X + q)e^{-sx_1}v_s\|_{L^2(M)} \\ &= o(|\tau|)\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.2. The main difference between this and the definition of a quasimode found in [11] is that the definition of a quasimode is independent of the x_1 direction, i.e. v_s there was a function defined on M_0 only; namely, in [11] it is only asked that $\|(\Delta - s^2)v_s\|_{L^2(M_0)} = o(|\tau|)$. This produces certain problems for us in the sense that the conjugated Laplacian $d_A^* d_A$ now splits in a non-trivial way in an x_1 component, x' component and a mixed component, unlike the ordinary Laplacian, $\Delta_{e\oplus g} = -|g|^{-1/2}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\big(|g|^{1/2}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\big) + \Delta_g$. As we will shortly see, this amounts to solving a certain $\bar{\partial}$-equation, which complicates things slightly.

5.1 Main constructions of Gaussian Beams

We will focus on constructing generalised quasimodes. We will call a vector field X on M a *skew-Hermitian vector field* if the coefficients of X in any chart are skew-Hermitian; moreover, we will need the notion of *skew-Hermitian matrix of vector fields*, which is a clear generalisation of the previously defined term. As a warm up for the general construction, we will first deal with the easy case of line bundles and M_0 simple, which comes out of our work in Section 4 – recall that in this case we have an ansatz for the eikonal equation (see Secton 4.1).

Recall also that a unit speed geodesic $\gamma : [0, L] \to M$ is called *non-tangential* if $\gamma(0), \gamma(L) \in \partial M$ and $\dot\gamma(0), \dot\gamma(L)$ not parallel to ∂M, with $\gamma(t)$ in the interior of M for $0 < t < L$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let (M_0, g) be a simple manifold and $\gamma : [0, L] \to M_0$ a non-tangential geodesic and let λ be a real parameter. Let X and Y be two smooth skew-Hermitian vector fields on M. Then there exists a family of generalised quasimodes satisfying the above conditions, i.e. if $s = \tau + i\lambda$, then there exists $v_s, \omega_s \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M_0)$ such that:*

$$\Big\| \Big((\Delta_g + X + q) + s(2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - X_1) - s^2 \Big) v_s \Big\|_{L^2(M)} = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_s\|_{L^2(M)} = O(1)$$
$$\Big\| \Big((\Delta_g + Y + q) + s(2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - Y_1) - s^2 \Big) \omega_s \Big\|_{L^2(M)} = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\omega_s\|_{L^2(M)} = O(1)$$

as $\tau \to \infty$ and for each $\phi \in C(M_0)$ and $x_1' \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} v_s \bar{\omega}_s \phi dV_{g_0} = \int_0^L e^{2\lambda t} e^{\Phi_1 + \bar{\Phi}_2} \phi(\gamma(t)) dt$$

where Φ_1 and Φ_2 are smooth on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, L]$ and satisfy the following equations:[8]

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) (\Phi_1) = \frac{1}{2}(X_1 + iX_r) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) (\Phi_2) = \frac{1}{2}(Y_1 + iY_r)$$

Proof. As in Section 4.1, consider a simple manifold D which contains M_0 and a point $p \in D$ such that $\mathbb{R} \times \{p\}$ is disjoint from M and consider the global polar coordinate system at this point. Furthermore, we proceed by picking a different conjugating exponent – we let $\rho = x_1 + ir$. By Lemma 4.1:

$$e^{s\rho} \Big(\Delta + X + q \Big) e^{-s\rho} u_s = (\Delta + X + q) - s \Big(\Delta \rho + X(\rho) - 2\langle d\rho, d\cdot \rangle \Big) u_s - s^2 |d\rho|^2 u_s$$

One wants to have a handle on the size of the right hand side, so one equates the linear and the quadratic terms in s to zero; we already did this in Section 4. The same construction gives us $u_s = |g|^{-1/4} \cdot a \cdot b_\tau(\theta)$, where a and $b_\tau \in C^\infty(S^{n-2})$ are chosen such that:

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) (a) = \frac{1}{2}(X_1 + iX_r)a$$
$$\|b_\tau\|^2_{L^2(S^{n-2})} = 1, \quad \|b_\tau\|^2_{W^{2,\infty}(S^{n-2})} = O(\tau^\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad |b_\tau|^2 dS \to \delta_{\theta_0}$$

i.e. b_τ is a C^∞ approximation to the delta function, with $\alpha < 1$; here dS is the volume element of S^{n-2}. We pick a of the form e^{Φ_1}, so that Φ_1 satisfies the equation:

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) (\Phi_1) = \frac{1}{2}(X_1 + iX_r)$$

Now, given u_s as above, we set $v_s = e^{-isr} u_s$:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{sx_1}(\Delta + X + q) e^{-sx_1} v_s &= e^{-isr} e^{s\rho} (\Delta + X + q) e^{-s\rho} u_s \\ &= e^{-isr} (\Delta + X + q) \Big(|g|^{-1/4} \cdot a \cdot b_\tau(\theta) \Big) =: f \end{aligned}$$

By using the properties of b_τ and the boundedness of other factors, we see that f is clearly equal to $O(\tau^\alpha)$ in $L^2(M)$. But this exactly means that v_s is a generalised

[8] In these equations, we extend the domain of definition of X and Y from M to $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$ smoothly to compactly supported vector fields and with a slight abuse of notation still denote them the same.

approximate eigenfunction. Completely analogously, we construct the ω_s function with respect to the other vector field, Y. Moreover, we have:

$$\int_{\{x_1'\}\times M_0} v_s\bar{\omega}_s\phi dV_{g_0} \to \int_0^L e^{2\lambda r}e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}\phi(\gamma(r))dr$$

when $\tau \to \infty$, for each x_1'. □

Now we are ready to make the passage to the case of the transversal manifold being *non-simple*, with the previous proposition giving us some intuition. Most of the proof we are about to see is analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.1 in [11]. The main difference is that, when constructing the amplitude a in $v_s = e^{is\Theta}a$, we do not get an ordinary differential equation – we get that a satisfies a certain $\bar{\partial}$ equation. This complicates the construction of a slightly and uses the properties of $\bar{\partial}$ equations we already discussed in Section 4.3. Moreover, the derivation of the limit integral is also more involved. We will prove the following theorem for line bundles first and then generalise to all vector bundles in a series of results after it:

Theorem 5.4 (Main construction of the Gaussian Beams)**.** *Let $\gamma : [0, L] \to M_0$ be a non-tangential geodesic and let λ be a real parameter, with M_0 any compact manifold with boundary. Let X and Y be two smooth skew-Hermitian vector fields on M. Then there exists a family of generalised quasimodes satisfying the above conditions, i.e. if $s = \tau + i\lambda$, then there exists $v_s, \omega_s \in C^\infty(M)$ such that:*

$$\left\|\Big((\Delta_g + X + q) + s(2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - X_1) - s^2\Big)v_s\right\|_{L^2(M)} = o(|\tau|) \quad \textit{and} \quad \|v_s\|_{L^2(M)} = O(1)$$
$$\left\|\Big((\Delta_g + Y + q) - s(2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - Y_1) - s^2\Big)\omega_s\right\|_{L^2(M)} = o(|\tau|) \quad \textit{and} \quad \|\omega_s\|_{L^2(M)} = O(1)$$

as $\tau \to \infty$ and for each $\phi \in C(M_0)$ and $x_1' \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \int_{\{x_1'\}\times M_0} v_s\bar{\omega}_s\phi dV_{g_0} = \int_0^L e^{-2\lambda t}e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}\phi(\gamma(t))dt$$

where Φ_1 and Φ_2 are smooth on $\mathbb{R}\times[0, L]$ and satisfy the following equations:

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right)(\Phi_1) = \frac{1}{2}(X_1 - iX_r) \quad \textit{and} \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right)(\bar{\Phi}_2) = \frac{1}{2}(-Y_1 + iY_r)$$

Moreover, the following limit holds for v_s and ω_s and any one form α on $\mathbb{R}\times M_0$:

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{1}{\tau}\int_{\{x_1'\}\times M_0} \langle\alpha, dv_s\rangle\bar{\omega}_s\phi dV = \int_0^L i\alpha(\dot{\gamma}(t))e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}e^{-2\lambda t}\phi(\gamma(t))dt$$

Proof. Firstly, let us isometrically embed our manifold (M_0, g) into a larger closed manifold $(\hat{M}, g)$ of the same dimension. This is possible since we can form the manifold $\hat{M} = M_0 \sqcup_{\partial M_0} M_0$, which is the disjoint union of two copies of M_0, glued along the boundary. We will extend the geodesic such that for $\epsilon > 0$ we have $\gamma(t) \in \hat{M} \setminus M$ for $t \in (-2\epsilon, 0) \cup (L, L + 2\epsilon)$; this is possible since γ is non-tangential.

Let us first introduce a set of local coordinates along the geodesic; a detailed account of this can be found in [11]. Since our manifold is compact and γ has no loops, we can assume γ self-intersects only finitely many times, at $0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_{N'} < L$ and that there is an open cover $\{(U_j, \varphi_j)\}_{j=0}^{N'+1}$ of $\gamma([-\epsilon, L+\epsilon])$ such that $\varphi_j(U_j) = I_j \times B$, where

I_js are open intervals and B a small $n-1$-dimensional ball. Also, $\varphi_j(\gamma(t)) = (t, 0)$ and t_js belong only to I_js and $\bar{I}_j \cap \bar{I}_k = \emptyset$ unless $|j-k| \leq 1$; φ_is agree on overlaps. These are called the *Fermi coordinates* and they have the following two properties along the geodesic: the metric is diagonal and $\partial_i g^{jk} = 0$ (and so the Christoffel symbols vanish). Also, let us denote by F the map from $[-\epsilon, L+\epsilon] \times B$ to $\hat{M}$, which restricts to the inverse charts on $I_i \times B$s; this is well defined since the charts agree on overlaps. The map F is locally a diffeomorphism, but is not globally because of self-intersections of the geodesic.

The first objective is to construct a quasimode locally, near a point $p_0 = \gamma(t_0)$ on $\gamma([-\epsilon, L+\epsilon])$; for this purpose we fix Fermi coordinates near p_0, i.e. choose (U, φ) with $U = \{(t, y) : |t - t_0| < \delta, |y| < \delta'\}$ such that the geodesic is described by the set of points $\Gamma = \{(t, 0)\}$ in U.

Let us seek for solutions of the form $v_s = e^{is\Theta}a$, where a and Θ will be complex functions supported in $|y| < \delta'/2$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{sx_1}(\Delta + X + q)e^{-sx_1}v_s = e^{is\Theta}e^{-s(-x_1+i\Theta)}(\Delta + X + q)e^{s(-x_1+i\Theta)}a \\ &= e^{is\Theta}\Big\{(\Delta+X+q)a+s\Big(2\frac{\partial a}{\partial x_1}-2i\langle d\Theta, da\rangle+\big(-X_1+iX(\Theta)\big)a+i\Delta(\Theta)a\Big)-s^2(1-|d\Theta|^2)a\Big\} \end{aligned}$$

by putting $\rho = -x_1 + i\Theta$ and using Lemma 4.1. Firstly, let us solve $|d\Theta|^2 = 1$ up to order $|y|^N$ on Γ. We look for Θ in the form $\Theta = \sum_{j=0}^N \Theta_j$, where:

$$\Theta_j = \sum_{|\alpha|=j} \frac{\Theta_{j,\alpha}(t)}{\alpha!} y^\alpha$$

are the homogeneous components and we write $g^{jk} = \sum_{l=0}^N g_l^{jk} + r_{N+1}^{jk}$, where

$$g_l^{jk}(t, y) = \sum_{|\beta|=l} \frac{g_{l,\beta}^{jk}(t)}{\beta!} y^\beta \quad \text{and} \quad r_{N+1}^{jk} = O(|y|^{N+1})$$

is the remainder in Taylor's theorem. By the properties of the coordinates, we have $g_0^{jk} = \delta^{jk}$ and $g_1^{jk} = 0$. Let us accordingly choose $\Theta_0(t, y) = t$ and $\Theta_1(t, y) = 0$. Most of the next step follows from the lines of [11], but we give it here for completeness:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle d\Theta, d\Theta\rangle - 1 = g^{jk}\partial_j\Theta\partial_k\Theta - 1 &= (1 + g_2^{11} + \dots)(1 + \partial_t\Theta_2 + \dots)(1 + \partial_t\Theta_2 + \dots) \\ &\quad + 2(g_2^{1\alpha} + \dots)(1 + \partial_t\Theta_2 + \dots)(\partial_{y_\alpha}\Theta_2 + \dots) \\ &\quad + (\delta^{\alpha\beta} + g_2^{\alpha\beta} + \dots)(\partial_{y_\alpha}\Theta_2 + \partial_{y_\alpha}\Theta_3 + \dots)(\partial_{y_\beta}\Theta_2 + \partial_{y_\beta}\Theta_3 + \dots) - 1 \\ &= [2\partial_t\Theta_2 + \nabla_y\Theta_2 \cdot \nabla_y\Theta_2 + g_2^{11}] + \sum_{p=2}^N (\dots) + O(|y|^{N+1}) \end{aligned}$$

We want to choose Θ_i such that the first bracket and the sum above vanish. We pick $\Theta_2(t, y) = \frac{1}{2}H(t)y \cdot y$ where $H(t)$ is a smooth complex symmetric matrix. For the first bracket to vanish, we need to have:

$$\dot{H}(t) + H(t)^2 = F(t)$$

where $F(t)$ is the symmetric matrix determined by $g_2^{11}(t, y) = -F(t)y \cdot y$. Choosing $H_0 = H(t_0)$ to be some complex symmetric matrix with $\mathrm{Im}(H)$ positive definite; following [11] this Ricatti equation has a unique smooth complex symmetric solution $H(t)$ with

$\mathrm{Im}(H(t))$ positive definite for all t. Now we find $\Theta_3, \dots$ by inductively solving the first order ODEs along Γ with an initial condition at t_0, obtained by collecting the homogeneous terms in y of higher order in the previous expansion. We obtain a smooth Θ such that $|d\Theta|^2 = 1$ up to order $|y|^N$.

Now we turn to the more interesting step, how to solve:

$$s\Big[2\frac{\partial a}{\partial x_1} - 2i\langle d\Theta, da\rangle + (-X_1 + iX(\Theta))a + i\Delta(\Theta)a\Big] + \Big(\Delta + X\Big)a = 0$$

up to order $|y|^N$. We look for a in the form

$$a = \tau^{\frac{m-1}{4}}(a_0 + s^{-1}a_{-1} + \dots + s^{-N}a_{-N})\chi(\frac{y}{\delta'})$$

where χ is a bump function defined such that $\chi = 1$ on $|y| \leq 1/4$, $\chi = 0$ for $|y| \geq 1/2$. We now equate each degree of s in the above expression to zero and obtain $N+1$ equations for each degree $1, 0, \dots -(N-1)$:

$$2\frac{\partial a_0}{\partial x_1} - 2i\langle d\Theta, da_0\rangle + \Big(- X_1 + iX(\Theta) + i\Delta(\Theta)\Big)a_0 = 0$$
$$2\frac{\partial a_j}{\partial x_1} - 2i\langle d\Theta, da_j\rangle + \Big(- X_1 + iX(\Theta) + i\Delta(\Theta)\Big)a_j + (\Delta + X)a_{j+1} = 0$$

for each $j = -1, \dots -(N-1)$. Let us introduce $\eta = i\Delta\Theta - X_1 + iX(\Theta)$ and write $\eta = \eta_0 + \dots + \eta_N + O(|y|^{N+1})$ for the Taylor expansion of η. We look for $a_0 = a_{00} + a_{01} + \dots + a_{0N}$ where each a_{0i} is a homogeneous polynomial of degree i. Then the degree one equation becomes:

$$2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}(a_{00} + \dots + a_{0N}) - 2ig^{jk}\partial_j\Theta\partial_k a + (\eta_0 + \eta_1 + \dots)(a_{00} + \dots + a_{0N}) = 0$$

to order $|y|^N$. After rewriting, this becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}(a_{00} + \dots a_{0N}) - 2i(1 + g_2^{11} + \dots)(1 + \partial_t\Theta_2 + \dots)(\partial_t a_{00} + \partial_t a_{01} + \dots) \\
&\qquad - 2i(g_2^{1\beta} + \dots)(1 + \partial_t\Theta_2 + \dots)(\partial_{y_\beta} a_{01} + \dots) \\
&\qquad - 2i(g_2^{\alpha 1} + \dots)(\partial_{y_\alpha}\Theta_2 + \dots)(\partial_t a_{00} + \partial_t a_{01} + \dots) \\
&\qquad - 2i(\delta^{\alpha\beta} + g_2^{\alpha\beta} + \dots)(\partial_{y_\alpha}\Theta_2 + \dots)(\partial_{y_\beta} a_{01} + \dots) \\
&\qquad + (\eta_0 + \eta_1 + \dots + \eta_N + O(|y|^{N+1}))(a_{00} + a_{01} + \dots + a_{0N}) \\
&= \Big[2\frac{\partial a_{00}}{\partial x_1} - 2i\partial_t a_{00} + \eta_0 a_{00}\Big] + \Big[2\frac{\partial a_{01}}{\partial x_1} - 2i\partial_t a_{01} - 2i\delta^{\alpha\beta}\partial_{y_\alpha}\Theta_2\partial_{y_\beta} a_{01} + a_{00} + \eta_1 a_{01}\Big] + \dots
\end{aligned}$$

where we have written down the first two terms in the y expansion. For us, the equation for a_{00} is particularly important (it will give us the value of a_0 along Γ). We have that $\eta_0 = (i\Delta\Theta - X_1 + iX(\Theta))(t, 0)$, where we know that $\Theta = t + 1/2H(t)y \cdot y + O(|y|^3)$. Therefore, we compute:

$$\Delta\Theta(t, 0) = -|g|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}(|g|^{\frac{1}{2}}g^{jk}\frac{\partial\Theta}{\partial x^k}) = -|g|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\partial|g|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\partial t} - \delta^{jk}H_{jk} = -\mathrm{tr}H(t)$$

So, our equation for a_{00} becomes:

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)a_{00} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(X_1 - iX_t + i\mathrm{tr}H(t)\Big)a_{00} \tag{5.1}$$

which we have seen in a more general, matrix case. Here, we want a solution of the form $a_{00} = e^{\Phi_1 + f_1}$, so that we obtain, for $\partial = 1/2(\partial/\partial x_1 - i\partial/\partial t)$

$$\partial\Phi_1 = \frac{1}{4}\Big(X_1 - iX_t\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr} H(t) \tag{5.2}$$

where Φ_1 is a function in both x_1 and t, f_1 is a function of just t. Now for the rest of the a_{0i} for $i > 0$, we obtain a similar vector valued equation of the form:

$$\partial v + Av + f = 0$$

where v and f are vectors and A is a matrix. The reason of this is that for $i > 0$, we get more components in the Taylor expansion, so we get a coefficient for each (think of a_{0i}s as vectors). This is solvable by our previous work on fundamental solutions of such equations, so that we produce an invertible matrix C such that $\partial C = -AC$ (see Section 4.3). Then we try $v = Cu$ for some vector function u and we get the equation: $\partial u = -C^{-1}f$, which we know how to solve in bounded domains (e.g. by using the generalised Cauchy integral formula). Hence we determine a_0 and proceed to determine a_is for $i > 0$ inductively.

At this point we make a remark about constructing the ω_s solution, which is the solution where we use e^{sx_1} exponent in the CGO solution (and hence the $-s$ in the formulation of the theorem). The point is that everything just gets a minus sign at each spot where we use x_1. Checking through the details, we obtain a version of the equation (5.2) (we use the fact that Y is skew-Hermitian):

$$\partial\bar{\Phi}_2 = \frac{1}{4}\Big(-Y_1 + iY_t\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr} H(t)$$

We are left with the terms of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{sx_1}(\Delta + X)e^{-sx_1}e^{is\Theta}a \\ &= e^{is\Theta}\tau^{\frac{m-1}{4}}\Big[s^2h_2a + sh_1 + \cdots + s^{-(N-1)}h^{-(N-1)} + s^{-N}(\Delta + X)a_{-N}\Big]\chi(\frac{y}{\delta'}) + e^{is\Theta}\tau^{\frac{m-1}{4}}sb\tilde{\chi}(\frac{y}{\delta'}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have h_js to be equal to zero to order $|y|^N$ on Γ; we also introduce b and $\tilde{\chi}$ to describe the leftover terms which appear upon differentiating the function χ in a sum, but which therefore are zero near and far away of Γ. Concretely, we have $b = 0$ for $|y| \leq \delta'/4$ and $\tilde{\chi} = 0$ for $|y| \geq 1/2$ and the most important fact about this term is that it is linear in s.

In order to determine some bounds on v_s, let us introduce a positive constant c, for which it holds that $\operatorname{Im} H(t)y \cdot y \geq c|y|^2$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{is\Theta}| &= e^{-\lambda \operatorname{Re}\Theta}e^{-\tau \operatorname{Im}\Theta} = e^{-\lambda t}e^{-\lambda O(|y|^2)}e^{-\frac{\tau}{2}\operatorname{Im} H(t)y\cdot y}e^{-\tau O(|y|^3)} \\ |v_s(t,y)| &\lesssim \tau^{\frac{m-1}{4}}e^{-\frac{1}{4}c\tau|y|^2}\chi(\frac{y}{\delta'}) \end{aligned}$$

after decreasing δ' if necessary and using the $1/4$ factor in the exponential to dominate the remaining $O(|y|^3)$ factor. Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_s\|_{L^2(U)} &\lesssim \|\tau^{\frac{m-1}{4}}e^{-\frac{1}{4}c\tau|y|^2}\|_{L^2(U)} = O(1) \\ \Big\|e^{sx_1}(\Delta + X)e^{-sx_1}v_s\Big\|_{L^2(U)} &\lesssim \Big\|\tau^{\frac{m-1}{4}}e^{-\frac{1}{4}c\tau|y|^2}\Big(\tau^2|y|^{N+1} + \tau^{-N} + \tau b\tilde{\chi}\Big)\Big\|_{L^2(U)} = O(|\tau|^{\frac{3-N}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second line is equal to $O(|\tau|^{-K})$ upon setting $N = 2K + 3$, for any fixed K, a positive integer.

If we have a non-empty intersection of U with the boundary ∂M, we record another estimate for future purposes. Namely, since the geodesic intersects the boundary transversely, we can introduce the implicit coordinates $\{(t(y), y) : |y| < \epsilon\}$ for some smooth function $t(y)$ and ϵ. Then for δ' small enough:

$$\|v_s\|^2_{L^2(\partial M)} = \int_{|y|<\epsilon} |v_s(t(y), y)|^2 dS(y) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} \tau^{\frac{m-1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}c\tau|y|^2} dy = O(1)$$

as $|\tau| \to \infty$.

Now we are done with the local construction and bounds and want to glue the solutions together with desired concentration properties. Firstly, notice that we could have solved the equations in Θ and a on $[-\epsilon, L+\epsilon] \times B$ with the pullback metric (by F), rather then to solve it locally. Let us denote by $v_s^{(j)}$ the pushforward of the so obtained solution on $U^{(j)}$. We thus obtain $v_s^{(0)}$, $v_s^{(1)}$,..., $v_s^{(r)}$. To glue these, let $\chi_j(t)$ be a partition of unity subordinate to $I^{(j)}$; the we extend these to $U^{(j)}$ by saying $\tilde{\chi}(t, y) = \chi_j(t)$ and finally let:

$$v_s = \sum_{j=0}^{r} \tilde{\chi}_j v_s^{(j)} \tag{5.3}$$

The previous remark allows us to have $v_s^{(j)} = v_s^{(j+1)}$ in the overlaps $U^{(j)} \cap U^{(j+1)}$. Now, pick small neighbourhoods of the geodesic self-intersection points $p_1, \dots, p_R$ and call them $V_1, \dots, V_R$; for δ' sufficiently small, we get that F is injective on the complement of the inverse image by F of the V_is. Therefore, we can pick a finite cover by $W_1, \dots, W_S$ of the remaining points on the geodesic such that $W_i \subset U^{(l_i)}$ for some l_i and $\operatorname{supp}(v_s) \subset \big(\cup V_i\big) \cup \big(\cup W_j\big)$ and moreover, the restrictions to these satisfy:

$$v_s|_{V_i} = \sum_{\gamma(t_l)=p_i} v_s^{(l)} \quad \text{and} \quad v_s|_{W_i} = v_s^{(l_i)} \tag{5.4}$$

It is now clear that the wanted L^2 bounds on v_s follow from our previous local considerations on each of $v_s^{(i)}$. We are left with the concentration results to prove – by considering the partitions of unity subordinate to V_is and W_js, we can assume that ϕ has compact support in one of these sets. Let us first consider the easier case where $\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \subset W_k$ for some k. By a completely analogous construction, we may assume that we have ω_s, too.

In W_k, we have $v_s = e^{is\Theta}a$ and $\omega_s = e^{is\Theta'}b$, where we dropped the indices to simplify notation. Notice that we may take $\Theta' = \Theta$, as all that we want is to have $|d\Theta'|^2 = 1$ up to order $|y|^N$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\{x_1'\}\times M_0} v_s \bar{\omega}_s \phi dV_g = \int e^{is\Theta} e^{-i\bar{s}\bar{\Theta}} a\bar{b}\phi dV_g \\
&= \int_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} e^{-2\lambda \operatorname{Re}\Theta} e^{-2\tau \operatorname{Im}\Theta} \tau^{\frac{m-1}{2}} (a_0 + O(\tau^{-1}))(\bar{b}_0 + O(\tau^{-1}))\chi(y/\delta')^2 \phi |g|^{1/2} dt dy \\
&= \int_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} e^{-\operatorname{Im} H(t)y\cdot y} e^{-2\tau^{-1/2}O(|x|^3)} e^{-2\tau^{-1}O(|x|^2)} e^{-2\lambda t} \tau^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \cdot \\
&\big(a_0(t, \tau^{-1/2}x) + O(\tau^{-1})\big)\big(\bar{b}_0(t, \tau^{-1/2}x) + O(\tau^{-1})\big)\chi\big(y/(\tau^{1/2}\delta')\big)^2 |g|^{1/2}\big(t, \tau^{-1/2}x\big)\phi dt dy
\end{aligned}$$

by performing the substitution $y = \tau^{-1/2}x$; we can see what the limit is – namely, by bounding $e^{-c|x|^2} e^{2A|x|^3/(\tau^{1/2})} e^{2B|x|^2/\tau} \leq e^{|x|^2(-c+2A\delta'+2B/\tau)}$, where c is as before the

positive constant such that $\operatorname{Im} H(t)y\cdot y \geq c|y|^2$ and using the fact that we integrate over $|y| \leq \tau^{1/2}\delta'$, by taking sufficiently small δ' we get exponent negative and hence we get an integrable function; thus we may use the Dominated convergence theorem to get this tends to, as $\tau \to \infty$:

$$\int_0^L e^{-2\lambda t} e^{\Phi_1+f_1+\bar{\Phi}_2+\bar{f}_2}\phi(x_1',\gamma(t))\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} e^{-\operatorname{Im} H(t)x\cdot x}dxdt$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} e^{-|y|^2}dy \int_0^L \frac{e^{-2\lambda t}e^{\Phi_1+f_1+\bar{\Phi}_2+\bar{f}_2}\phi(x_1',\gamma(t))}{\sqrt{\det \operatorname{Im} H(t)}}dt \quad (5.5)$$

by using the linear change of variable by the matrix $\operatorname{Im} H(t)$. However, from before we know that:

$$\det(\operatorname{Im} H(t)) = \det(\operatorname{Im} H(t_0))e^{-2\int_{t_0}^t \operatorname{tr}\operatorname{Re} H(s)ds} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial(f_1+\bar{f}_2)}{\partial t} = -\operatorname{tr}\operatorname{Re} H(t)$$

Hence we obtain cancellation in the above integral and by picking the initial condition for $H(t_0)$ such that $\det(\operatorname{Im} H(t_0)) = 1$, we finally get the desired limit:

$$\int_0^L e^{-2\lambda t}e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}\phi(\gamma(t))dt$$

Moreover, in the case where we have $\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \subset V_j$ for some j, we have $v_s = \sum_{\gamma(t_l)=p_j} v_s^{(l)}$ and $\omega_s = \sum_{\gamma(t_l)=p_j} \omega_s^{(l)}$, which means that we have the following expression:

$$v_s\bar{\omega}_s = \sum_{\gamma(t_l)=p_j} v_s^{(l)}\bar{\omega}_s^{(l)} + \sum_{l\neq l',\gamma(t_l)=\gamma(t_{l'})=p_j} v_s^{(l)}\bar{\omega}_s^{(l')}$$

We want to show that the mixed terms vanish; i.e. want to show $\int_{V_j\cap M_0} v_s^{(l)}\bar{\omega}_s^{(l')}\phi dV_g \to 0$ as $\tau\to\infty$ for $l \neq l'$, so that we are left with the expression from the statement – this would prove our claim. From now on, we drop the subscript s to relax the notation.

Let us use the fact that $\frac{\partial\Theta}{\partial t}(t,0) = 1$. This gives us that for $\varphi = \operatorname{Re}(\Theta^{(l)} - \Theta^{(l')})$ we have $d\varphi \neq 0$ at the point p_j, as the geodesic intersects itself transversally. Therefore, by further reducing δ' if necessary, we may assume that $d\varphi$ is non-vanishing in V_j.

Let $p^{(l)} = e^{-s\operatorname{Im}\Theta^{(l)}}e^{-\lambda\operatorname{Re}\Theta^{(l)}}a^{(l)}$ and analogously $q^{(l)} = e^{-s\operatorname{Im}\Theta^{(l)}}e^{-\lambda\operatorname{Re}\Theta^{(l)}}b^{(l)}$. Then we can write $v^{(l)} = e^{i\tau\operatorname{Re}(\Theta^{(l)})}p^{(l)}$ and similarly $\omega^{(l)} = e^{i\tau\operatorname{Re}(\Theta^{(l)})}q^{(l)}$. Then one can easily check that:

$$\int_{V_j\cap M} v^{(l)}\bar{\omega}^{(l')}dV_g = \int_{V_j\cap M} e^{i\tau\varphi}p^{(l)}\bar{q}^{(l')}dV_g$$

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. In order to be able to do calculus with ϕ, we split it into a smooth and a sufficiently small part: let $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2$, where $\phi_1 \in C_c^\infty(V_j\cap M)$ smooth and $\|\phi_2\|_{L^\infty(V_j\cap M)} \leq \epsilon$. For the ϕ_2 part, we have the bound $\left|\int_{V_j\cap M} e^{i\tau\varphi}p^{(l)}\bar{q}^{(l')}\phi_2 dV_g\right| \lesssim \|p^{(l)}\|_{L^2}\|\bar{q}^{(l')}\|_{L^2}\|\phi_2\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \epsilon$, since $\|p^{(l)}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|v^{(l)}\|_{L^2} = O(1)$.

For the main, smooth part we perform integration by parts with the operator $Lf = \langle|d\varphi|^{-2}d\varphi, df\rangle$, by noting that $\frac{1}{i\tau}L(e^{i\tau\varphi}) = e^{i\tau\varphi}$:

$$\int_{V_j\cap M} e^{i\tau\varphi}p^{(l)}\bar{q}^{(l')}\phi_1 dV_g = \int_{V_j\cap\partial M}\frac{\partial_\nu\varphi}{i\tau|d\varphi|^2}e^{i\tau\varphi}p^{(l)}\bar{q}^{(l')}\phi_1 dS$$
$$+\frac{1}{i\tau}\int_{V_j\cap M} e^{i\tau\varphi}L^t(p^{(l)}\bar{q}^{(l')}\phi_1)dV_g$$

where L^t is the transpose of the operator L. Now we have the job to estimate the two integrals on the right hand side; the proof of this is identical to the proof in [11]. By using the fact that $\int \tau^{\frac{m-1}{2}} e^{-c\tau|y|^2}|y|^2 dy = O(\tau^{-1})$ and that in the local chart determined by l, $|d \operatorname{Im} \Theta^{(l)}| \lesssim |y|$, we have:

$$\| |d \operatorname{Im} \Theta^{(l)}| v^{(l)} \|_{L^2} \|\bar{\omega}^{(l')}\| \|\phi_1\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \tau^{-1/2}$$

But this is exactly the form of summand that contributes the most to the second integral; it is the one that is obtained upon acting of L^t on $e^{-s \operatorname{Im} \Theta^{(l)}}$, because after differentiation we get an extra τ term which happily cancels with $\frac{1}{i\tau}$; everything else is bounded.

The boundary integral is bounded by previous local bounds; hence the $\frac{1}{i\tau}$ factor takes care of it. Therefore, finally, by using the previous case on each of the factors $v_s^{(l)} \bar{\omega}_s^{(l)}$, we have that:

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} v_s^{(l)} \bar{\omega}^{(l)} \phi dV_g = \int_{I^{(l)}} e^{-2\lambda t} e^{\Phi_1 + \bar{\Phi}_2} \phi dt$$

So by adding these for time intervals $I^{(l)}$ for $\gamma(t_l) = p_j$, we get the desired result.

We are left with the final piece of the proof, which is concerned about the concentration properties of the solutions when coupled with a 1-form. As before, by using a partition of unity, we may assume ϕ has compact support in some of the W_k or V_i (the part of ϕ which is zero near the geodesic, can be made to have disjoint support with v_s).

Let us first consider the case $\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \subset W_k$. Here we have $v_s|_{W_k} = v^{(l)} = e^{is\Theta^{(l)}} a^{(l)}$ and $\omega_s|_{W_k} = \omega^{(l)} = e^{is\Theta^{(l)}} b^{(l)}$ for some l. We want to compute the following limit, where we use the $x = (t, y)$ coordinates: (we drop some of the subscripts)

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} g^{ij} \alpha_i \frac{\partial v_s}{\partial x^j} \bar{\omega}_s \psi dV_g = \frac{is}{\tau} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} g^{ij} \alpha_i \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x^j} v_s \bar{\omega}_s \phi dV_g$$
$$+ \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} g^{ij} \alpha_i e^{is\Theta} \frac{\partial a}{\partial x^j} \bar{\omega_s} \phi dV_g \to \int_0^L i\alpha_t e^{\Phi_1 + \bar{\Phi}_2} e^{-2\lambda t} \phi dt$$

as $t \to \infty$; this is because the first integral can be computed by our previous considerations and using the fact that $\Theta = t + 1/2 \operatorname{Im} H(t) y \cdot y + O(|y|^3)$ to compute the derivatives along the geodesic. Furthermore, the second term goes to zero by this simple estimate:

$$\|\omega_s\|_{L^2} \int_0^L \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} |\alpha|^2 |e^{is\Theta}|^2 |da|^2 dy dt \lesssim \int_0^L \int_{\mathbb{R}^{m-1}} \tau^{\frac{m-1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} c\tau|y|^2} dy dt = O(1) \qquad (5.6)$$

which finishes the proof in this case.

For the more complicated case $\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \subset V_k$, we have that $v_s = \sum_{\gamma(t_l) = p_k} v_s^{(l)}$ and $\omega_s = \sum_{\gamma(t_l) = p_k} \omega_s^{(l)}$. In the coordinates $x = (t, y)$ corresponding to $I^{(i)}$, we have:

$$\int g^{ij} \frac{\partial v^{(i)}}{\partial x^j} \bar{\omega}^{(j)} \phi dV_g = \frac{is}{\tau} \int g^{ij} \alpha_i \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x^j} v^{(i)} \bar{\omega}^{(j)} \phi dV_g + \frac{1}{\tau} \int g^{ij} \alpha_i e^{is\Theta} \frac{\partial a}{\partial x^j} \bar{\omega}^{(j)} \phi dV_g$$

where $v^{(i)} = e^{is\Theta} a$. Now by the previous steps, we easily see that, if $i \neq j$, the first term is zero in the limit and the second term goes to zero by the bound (5.6) above. However, if we have $i = j$, by the previous step we again have the right limit, which is $\int_{I^{(i)}} i\alpha_t e^{\Phi_1 + \bar{\Phi}_2} e^{-2\lambda t} dt$. Combining the results, we obtain:

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} \langle dv_s, \alpha \rangle \bar{\omega}_s \phi dV_g = \sum_{\gamma(t_l) = p_k} \int_{I^{(l)}} i\alpha_t e^{\Phi_1 + \bar{\Phi}_2} e^{-2\lambda t} \phi dt = \int_0^L i\alpha_t e^{\Phi_1 + \bar{\Phi}_2} e^{-2\lambda t} \phi dt$$

which finally finishes the proof. Similarly to this last part of the proof we can determine the limit where the integrand is $\langle \alpha, d\bar{\omega}_s \rangle v_s \phi$; we get the same limit with just a minus sign in front. □

Remark 5.5. The equation (5.2) defining Φ_1 is invariant under summing with an anti-holomorphic function. Therefore, in the previous theorem, we could have inserted an extra anti-holomorphic part h in the integrand of the limit. Moreover, we can see from the proof that we could have changed the $o(\tau)$ asymptotic with the stronger, $O(|\tau|^{-K})$ convergence, for any $K > 0$; however, this will not be necessary in what comes next.

Remark 5.6. It is also of interest to mention that the above construction works for metrics on $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$ that are *conformal* to the product metric (this is also considered in [11]). However, for simplicity we have omitted this conformal factor from the statement of this theorem, but more importantly we can prove Theorem 5.9 without this fact.

We are also interested in a vector valued version of the previous theorem. The statement of this theorem is completely analogous for vectors (matrices), as well as the proof; however, we give a sketch of the proof at some points of difference in the following statement ($E' = \mathbb{R} \times M_0 \times \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ is the vector bundle of matrices with the fibrewise Hermitian inner product $\langle A, B \rangle = \operatorname{tr}(AB^*)$):

Theorem 5.7 (Construction of the vector valued Gaussian Beams)**.** *Let $\gamma : [0, L] \to M_0$ be a non-tangential geodesic and let λ be a real parameter, with M_0 any compact manifold with boundary. Let X and Y be two skew-Hermitian matrices of vector fields on M and q a matrix potential. Then there exists a family of generalised quasimodes satisfying the above conditions, i.e. if $s = \tau + i\lambda$, then there exists $v_s, \omega_s \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M_0, E')$ such that:*

$$\left\| \Big((\Delta_g + X + q) + s(2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - X_1) - s^2 \Big) v_s \right\|_{L^2(M; E'|_M)} = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_s\|_{L^2} = O(1)$$
$$\left\| \Big((\Delta_g + Y + q) - s(2\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - Y_1) - s^2 \Big) \omega_s \right\|_{L^2(M; E'|_M)} = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\omega_s\|_{L^2} = O(1)$$

as $\tau \to \infty$ and for each $\phi \in C(M_0)$ and $x_1' \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} \operatorname{tr}(v_s \omega_s^*) \phi dV_{g_0} = \int_0^L e^{-2\lambda t} \operatorname{tr}(C_X C_Y^*) \phi(\gamma(t)) dt$$

where C_X and C_Y are smooth $m \times m$ matrices on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, L]$ which satisfy the following equations:

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right)(C_X) = \frac{1}{2}(X_1 - iX_r)C_X \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right)(C_Y^*) = \frac{1}{2} C_Y^*(-Y_1 + iY_r) \tag{5.7}$$

Moreover, the following limit holds for v_s and ω_s and any one form α on $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$:

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\{x_1'\} \times M_0} \operatorname{tr}(\langle \alpha, dv_s \rangle \omega_s^*) \phi dV = \int_0^L i\alpha(\dot{\gamma}(t)) \operatorname{tr}(C_X C_Y^*) e^{-2\lambda t} \phi(\gamma(t)) dt$$

Proof. Same as the proof of Theorem 5.4, with a few remarks. Firstly, every appearance of $v_s \bar{\omega}_s$ is replaced by the inner product $\operatorname{tr}(v_s \omega_s^*)$ and we are looking for $v_s = e^{is\Theta} a$, where this time a is a *matrix*; so the action of X and Y is matrix multiplication from the left. However, formally, the computations stay the same until the appearance of

$\Phi_{1,2}$; the $C_{X,Y}$ take their role, this time as matrices. Namely, when we arrive to the equation for a_{00}, which is (5.1):

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)a_{00} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(X_1 - iX_t + i\mathrm{tr}H(t)\Big)a_{00}$$

we ask for matrices C_X and C_1 such that $a_{00} = C_X C_1$, where:

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)C_X = \frac{1}{2}\Big(X_1 - iX_t\Big)C_X \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial C_1}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(H(t))C_1(t)$$

so that $C_{1,2}$ play the role of $f_{1,2}$. One checks that such a_{00} satisfies the conditions and for $C_1(t)$ we just take the diagonal matrix obtained by integration. This is later used to get the cancellation of $\sqrt{\det \mathrm{Im}\, H(t)}$ with $C_1 C_2^*$, which jumps out of the trace as before in the integral (5.5).

Later, when proving the mixed products vanish, the p's and q's introduced translate to matrices naturally and the estimates which follow stay the same. Finally, let us note that C_X is invariant under multiplication on the right by an anti-holomorphic (conjugate holomorphic) matrix in the sense we could replace C_X by $C_X H$ for such a matrix H. □

Remark 5.8. [Everything works for arbitrary vector bundles.] We can now easily extend the construction from the case of trivial vector bundles to the case of possibly topologically non-trivial ones, equipped by a unitary connection. We restrict our attention just to operators $d_A^* d_A + Q$ induced by connections and potentials. Basically, what we need to do is to imitate the above vector proof with small alterations: to start with, let us recall the Fermi coordinates given by a map $F : U = [-\epsilon, \epsilon + L] \times B_\delta \to M$, where B_δ is a small ball in dimension $(n-1)$ – F is a local diffeomorphism, giving us the 'tube' around the geodesic. Therefore, we can pull-back the bundle E to the trivial bundle $F^*E = U \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with the standard metric; we pull back the connection, too. Furthermore, in this case we cannot work on End E as we previously did in Section 4.5. This means we have to restrict to vector solutions and in particular our solutions to the transport equation that go into the Gaussian beams will be vectors. Then we may run the proof again; the only thing we need to replace are the resulting concentration properties:

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \int_{\{x_1'\}\times M_0} \langle v_s, \omega_s\rangle_E \phi dV_{g_0} = \int_0^L e^{-2\lambda t}\langle C_1 a_1, C_2 a_2\rangle \phi(\gamma(t))dt$$

where C_1 and C_2 are constructed on U for connections A_1 and A_2 as fundamental solutions to the $\bar\partial$-equation (5.7), respectively; the a_1 is anti-holomorphic so that $C_1 a_1$ solves the vector ∂-equation and a_2 is analogously holomorphic, so that $C_2 a_2$ solves the $\bar\partial$-equation. Then we may in particular set a_i to be constant and vary these constants to deduce various properties.

For the other identity we have to be slightly more careful; namely dv_s is not well defined as for the trivial bundle. However, we may define it as dv_s in our construction in U and then push it forward by the same method of partition of unity and the Fermi map F to the neighborhood of the geodesic (as in (5.3)) and hence to the whole manifold as a 1-form with values in E (and with support in a neighbourhood of the geodesic). Then the identity becomes:

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{1}{\tau}\int_{\{x_1'\}\times M_0} \Big\langle \langle \alpha, dv_s\rangle_{T^*M}, \omega_s \Big\rangle_E \phi dV = \int_0^L i\alpha(\dot\gamma(t))\langle C_1 a_1, C_2 a_2\rangle e^{-2\lambda t}\phi(\gamma(t))dt$$

5.2 Application of Gaussian Beams

We now give a concrete application of of the construction of generalised quasimodes – the construction of the CGO solutions. By using the already proved Carleman estimates from Section 3, we can just put the ingredients together in a simple way; later we prove a recovery result. For this Section, assume we are working in the setting of the CTA manifolds, that is $\tilde{g} = e \oplus g_0$ with $g = c\tilde{g}$, where as usual we have $(M, g) \Subset (\mathbb{R} \times M_0, g)$ and of the same dimension n.

Proposition 5.9 (CGO construction)**.** *Let E be a Hermitian vector bundle, A a unitary connection and Q be a smooth section of the endomorphism bundle* End E*. Let $s = \tau + i\lambda$, where τ and λ are real numbers. Then there exists τ_0, such that for $|\tau| \geq \tau_0$ large enough, there exists a smooth solution $u = e^{-sx_1}c^{-\frac{n-2}{4}}(v_s + r_s)$ to the equation $\mathcal{L}_{g,A,Q}u = 0$, with the following conditions fulfilled:*

$$\|r_s\|_{L^2(M;E)} = o(1), \quad \|r_s\|_{H^1(M;E)} = o(|\tau|) \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_s\|_{L^2(M;E)} = O(1)$$

as $|\tau| \to \infty$ and the concentration properties for v_s as in Theorem 5.4.

Proof. Let us firstly notice the identity:

$$c^{\frac{n+2}{4}}\mathcal{L}_{g,A,Q}(u) = \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g},A,c(Q+Q_c)}(e^{-sx_1}(v_s + r_s))$$

where $Q_c = c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}\Delta_g(c^{-\frac{n-2}{4}})$. Therefore, if we let v_s be the function constructed in the proof of Theorem 5.4, with all its concentration properties, we will have

$$\|e^{sx_1}\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g},A,c(Q+Q_c)}e^{-sx_1}v_s\|_{L^2(M;E)} = o(|\tau|)$$

Hence, to have the required form of the solution, r_s must satisfy

$$e^{\tau x_1}\mathcal{L}_{g,A,Q}e^{-\tau x_1}(c^{-\frac{n-2}{4}}e^{-i\lambda x_1}r_s) = -c^{-\frac{n+2}{4}}e^{-i\lambda x_1}e^{sx_1}\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g},A,c(Q+Q_c)}e^{-sx_1}v_s$$

But fortunately, now the right hand side is $o(|\tau|)$ by construction and c is bounded, hence we may apply the existence theorem – Theorem 3.4. □

Theorem 5.10 (Main recovery)**.** *Suppose A_1 and A_2 are two unitary connections on $E = M \times \mathbb{C}$ and that the Cauchy data spaces C_{A_1} and C_{A_2} are the same. If the geodesic ray transform on M_0 is injective on* 1*-forms and functions, then we must have $dA_1 = dA_2$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{A} = A_2 - A_1$. By Theorem 5.9, we have the solutions

$$u = e^{-(\tau+i\lambda)x_1}c^{-\frac{n-2}{4}}(v_1 + r_1) \quad \text{and} \quad v = e^{(\tau+i\lambda)x_1}c^{-\frac{n-2}{4}}(v_2 + r_2)$$

to the equations $\mathcal{L}_{A_1}u = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{A_2}v = 0$, with the desired concentration and decay properties. It is worth noting that v_is are defined on the whole $\mathbb{R} \times M_0$ and r_is on M. By applying Theorem 2.4, we obtain the following equality (dV_g is the volume form):

$$\int_M (|A_1|_g^2 - |A_2|_g^2)u\bar{v}dV_g + \int_M \left\langle A_2 - A_1, ud\bar{v} - \bar{v}du \right\rangle_g dV_g = 0 \tag{5.8}$$

Observe that in the first factor we have q_is and A_is bounded, which together with L^2 bounds on v_is and r_is from the construction theorem gives us that the first term is equal to $O(1)$. Now, we will divide by τ and take the $\tau \to \infty$ limit. First note that:

$$\bar{v}du = e^{-2i\lambda x_1}c^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}\Big(\big(c^{\frac{n-2}{4}}d(c^{-\frac{n-2}{4}}) - (\tau + i\lambda)\big)dx_1(\bar{v}_2 + \bar{r}_2)(v_1 + r_1) + (\bar{v}_2 + \bar{r}_2)(dv_1 + dr_1)\Big)$$

and similarly for $ud\bar{v}$. The factor containing the derivative of c will be zero in the limit, when divided by τ. Therefore, when plugging in these expressions in (5.8), we can neglect the r_i factors and hence obtain the limit:

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\int_M\langle\tilde{A},\bar{v}du\rangle_g dV_g=\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\int_M e^{-2i\lambda x_1}c^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}\frac{1}{c}\Big\langle\tilde{A},(-\tau+i\lambda)v_1\bar{v}_2dx_1 \\ +\bar{v}_2dv_1\Big\rangle_{\tilde{g}}c^{\frac{n}{2}}dV_{\tilde{g}}=\int_0^L\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}e^{-2i\lambda x_1}(-\tilde{A}_1+i\tilde{A}_t)e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}e^{-2\lambda t}dx_1dt$$

where, in the second line we have gone from the integral over M to an integral over $\mathbb{R}\times M_0$; this is allowed since, by a *boundary determination* result (see Section 8 of [10]), we can assume that $\tilde{A}|_{\partial M}=0$ to infinite order. Also, we have used that the inner product on forms is given by the inverse of the metric g; hence the $\frac{1}{c}$ factor happily cancels with the other c factors. The Φ_i functions satisfy the following equations, where $X=-2g^{ij}(A_1)_i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$ and $Y=-2g^{ij}(A_2)_i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$ are the first order terms of the connection Laplacian:

$$\frac{\partial\Phi_1}{\partial z}=\frac{1}{2}(-(A_1)_1+i(A_1)_t)\quad\text{and}\quad\frac{\partial\bar{\Phi}_2}{\partial z}=\frac{1}{2}((A_2)_1-i(A_2)_t)$$

where $z=x_1+it$ is the complex variable and $\bar{z}=x_1-it$ is its conjugate. By summing the two equations, we get:

$$\frac{\partial(\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2)}{\partial z}=\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{A}_1-i\tilde{A}_t)\tag{5.9}$$

Now we obtain a similar expression for the $ud\bar{v}$ part, namely:

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\int_M\langle\tilde{A},ud\bar{v}\rangle=\int_0^L\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}e^{-2i\lambda x_1}(\tilde{A}_1-i\tilde{A}_t)e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}e^{-2\lambda t}dx_1dt$$

and finally obtain the limit for (5.8):

$$0=\int_0^L\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}e^{-2i\lambda x_1}(\tilde{A}_1-i\tilde{A}_t)e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}e^{-2\lambda t}dx_1dt\tag{5.10}$$

By using Stokes' theorem and noting that $dz\wedge d\bar{z}=2idx_1\wedge dt$, together with (5.9), on a smooth subdomain $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}\times[0,L]$ which contains the support of $\tilde{A}$:

$$0=\int_\Omega d\Big(e^{-2i\lambda x_1}e^{-2\lambda t}e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}d\bar{z}\Big)=\int_{\partial\Omega}e^{-2i\lambda x_1}e^{-2\lambda t}e^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}d\bar{z}$$

Now by exploiting the fact that we could put an arbitrary anti-holomorphic h as a multiplier of e^{Φ_1}, we obtain the integral identity:

$$0=\int_{\partial\Omega}e^{-2i\lambda x_1}e^{-2\lambda t}he^{\Phi_1+\bar{\Phi}_2}d\bar{z}$$

for all such h. Let us take Ω simply-connected, e.g. $\Omega=[-N,N]\times[0,L]$ for some large N, such that $[-N,N]\times M_0$ contains a neighbourhood of M. This means that upon conjugating, by Lemma 4.8, the restriction of the function $e^{\bar{\Phi}_1+\Phi_2}$ at the boundary is a restriction of a non-vanishing holomorphic function F, defined on Ω, i.e. $F|_{\partial\Omega}=e^{\bar{\Phi}_1+\Phi_2}|_{\partial\Omega}$. Moreover, since Ω is simply-connected, we can find a logarithm, so that

$F = e^G$, where G is holomorphic and $G|_{\partial\Omega} = \bar{\Phi}_1 + \Phi_2$. After using Stokes' theorem again with $\bar{h} = Ge^{-G}$, we obtain:

$$0 = \int_\Omega e^{2\lambda i(x_1+it)}(\tilde{A}_1 + i\tilde{A}_t)dz \wedge d\bar{z}$$

and so finally:

$$0 = \int_0^L \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\lambda i(x_1+it)}(\tilde{A}_1 + i\tilde{A}_t)dx_1 dt$$

Let us define:

$$f(x', \lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda x_1}\tilde{A}_1(x_1, x')dx_1$$
$$\alpha(x', \lambda) = \sum_{j=2}^{n}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda x_1}\tilde{A}_j(x_1, x')dx_1\Big)dx^j = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda x_1}\big(\tilde{A} - \tilde{A}_1(x_1, x')\big)dx_1$$

With this notation, the identity above becomes (replace 2λ with λ w.l.o.g.):

$$0 = \int_0^L e^{-\lambda r}(f + i\alpha(\dot{\gamma}(r)))dr$$

along any unit speed, non-tangential geodesic in M_0. We would like to use the fact that the geodesic transform is injective as much as we can, even though we obtained some sort of an attenuated transform. Thus we set $\lambda = 0$ and use the injectivity of the ray transforms to get $\alpha(x', 0) = -idp_0$ and $f(x', 0) = 0$ for some smooth p_0 such that $p_0|_{\partial M} = 0$. Furthermore, we can take the $\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}$ derivative of the integral to get:

$$\int_0^L e^{-\lambda r}\Big(-r(f + i\alpha) + \frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}(f + i\alpha)\Big)dr = 0$$

Again we plug in $\lambda = 0$ and use injectivity, together with the following calculation:

$$\int_0^L ri\alpha dr = \int_0^L r\frac{\partial p_0}{\partial r}dr = -\int_0^L p_0 dr$$

where we used the fact that p_0 vanishes at the boundary. Now using that $f = 0$, we finally obtain:

$$p_0 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial\lambda} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial\lambda} = -idp_1$$

for some smooth p_1 which vanishes at the boundary. Now it is more or less clear how are we going to proceed about this inductively, but let us go one step further for clarity. Taking another derivative with respect to λ, we have:

$$\int_0^L e^{-\lambda r}\Big(r^2(f + i\alpha) - 2r\frac{\partial(f + i\alpha)}{\partial\lambda} + \frac{\partial^2(f + i\alpha)}{\partial\lambda^2}\Big) = 0$$

Now by partial integration and using the properties of p_0, p_1, we have:

$$\int_0^L r^2 i\alpha dr = -\int_0^L 2rp_0 dr \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^L ri\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial\lambda} = -\int_0^L p_1 dr$$

Thus by plugging in $\lambda = 0$ and substituting:

$$\int_0^L \Big((2p_1 + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda^2}) + i\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial \lambda^2}\Big)dr = 0$$

Again, we get some smooth p_2 vanishing at the boundary such that $\frac{\partial^2 \alpha}{\partial \lambda^2} = -idp_2$ and $2p_1 + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda^2} = 0$.

Now, let us assume inductively that $\frac{\partial^j \alpha}{\partial \lambda^j} = -idp_j$ and $jp_{j-1} + \frac{\partial^j f}{\partial \lambda^j} = 0$, for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ and p_j are smooth functions on M_0 vanishing at the boundary (with $p_{-1} = 0$ predefined). We will prove the existence of p_n by induction. Let us define:

$$S = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial \lambda^n}\int_0^L e^{-\lambda r}(f + i\alpha)dr = \int_0^L e^{-\lambda r}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\binom{n}{j}(-1)^j r^j \frac{\partial^{n-j}(f + i\alpha)}{\partial \lambda^{n-j}}\right)dr = 0$$

for all n. Now, using the following formulas for $\lambda = 0$:

$$\int_0^L r^i \frac{\partial^{n-i} f}{\partial \lambda^{n-i}}dr = \int_0^L r^i\Big(-(n-i)p_{n-i-1}\Big)dr = -(n-i)\int_0^L r^i p_{n-i-1}dr$$

valid for $i > 0$ and:

$$\int_0^L r^k \frac{\partial^{n-k}(i\alpha)}{\partial \lambda^{n-k}}dr = \int_0^L r^k \frac{\partial p_{n-k}}{\partial r}dr = -k\int_0^L r^{k-1} p_{n-k}dr$$

for $k > 0$, and inserting them in the expression for S, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \int_0^L \frac{\partial^n (f + i\alpha)}{\partial \lambda^n}dr + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\binom{n}{j}(-1)^j \int_0^L \Big((-(n-j)r^j p_{n-j-1} - jr^{j-1}p_{n-j})\Big)dr \\
&= \int_0^L r^0\Big(\frac{\partial^n (f + i\alpha)}{\partial \lambda^n} + np_{n-1}\Big)dr + \int_0^L r^1\Big(n(n-1)p_{n-2} - 2p_{n-2}\cdot\frac{n(n-1)}{2}\Big)dr + \\
&+ \cdots + \int_0^L r^j\Big(\binom{n}{j}(-1)^{j+1}(n-j)p_{n-j-1} - (j+1)p_{n-j-1}\binom{n}{j+1}(-1)^{j+1}\Big)dr + \cdots \\
&= \int_0^L \Big(\frac{\partial^n (f + i\alpha)}{\partial \lambda^n} + np_{n-1}\Big)dr = 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line is true by cancelling the expressions in the brackets for r^j, where $j > 0$. Therefore, there must exist p_n vanishing at the boundary such that $\frac{\partial^n f}{\partial \lambda^n} + np_{n-1} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial^n (\alpha)}{\partial \lambda^n} = -idp_n$. Now the proof by induction is complete.

Coming back to the main proof, we see that:

$$\sum_{2 \le j < k} \mathcal{F}\Big(\partial_j \tilde{A}_k - \partial_k \tilde{A}_j\Big)dx^j \wedge dx^k = d\alpha$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the Fourier transform in the x_1 direction. Furthermore, we have:

$$\frac{\partial^n}{\partial \lambda^n}\Big|_{\lambda=0}\mathcal{F}\Big(\partial_j \tilde{A}_k - \partial_k \tilde{A}_j\Big) = d\Big(\frac{\partial^n}{\partial \lambda^n}\Big|_{\lambda=0}\alpha\Big)_{j\wedge k} = d(-idp_n)_{j\wedge k} = 0$$

where $\beta_{i\wedge j}$, for $i < j$, denotes the $dx^i \wedge dx^j$ component of the two form β; the above equation holds for all $n \ge 0$. Therefore, since the Fourier transform of a compactly supported function is analytic, we must have: $\partial_j \tilde{A}_k \equiv \partial_k \tilde{A}_j$ for all $j, k \ge 2$.

Furthermore, since we have $\mathcal{F}\Big(\partial_j \tilde{A}_1 - \partial_1 \tilde{A}_j\Big) = i\lambda\alpha_j + \partial_j f$ and because:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^n}{\partial\lambda^n}\Big|_{\lambda=0}\mathcal{F}\Big(\partial_j \tilde{A}_k - \partial_k \tilde{A}_j\Big) &= \partial_j \frac{\partial^n f}{\partial\lambda^n} + ni\frac{\partial^{n-1}\alpha_j}{\partial\lambda^{n-1}} \\ &= ni(-i\frac{\partial p_{n-1}}{\partial x^j}) + \partial_j(-np_{n-1}) = 0\end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq 0$ and $j \geq 2$, in the same manner as before we have that $\partial_j \tilde{A}_1 \equiv \partial_1 \tilde{A}_j$; gluing this information together, we finally conclude that $d\tilde{A} = 0$ or equivalently that $dA_1 = dA_2$. This finishes the proof. □

Remark 5.11. [Partial boundary data case.] Assume we are in the setting of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 5.10, i.e. that we have the partial Cauchy data spaces that agree on a neighbourhood Γ of the front side, $C^{\Gamma}_{A_1} = C^{\Gamma}_{A_2}$. Then we are still able to prove $dA_1 = dA_2$ as follows, according to the ideas from [9]. We think of the point x_0 in Theorem 1.1 from [9] as the point at "infinity" so that the rays are straight lines along the x_1 axis.

Define $F_\epsilon = \{x \mid \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \nu(x)\rangle = \nu_1(x) < \epsilon\}$, with ϵ small enough such that $F_\epsilon \subset \Gamma$. Consider the CGO solutions $\mathcal{L}_{A_1} u = \mathcal{L}_{A_2} v = 0$ such that $u|_{\partial M} = f$ and $v|_{\partial M} = g$. Then the assumption on the Cauchy data spaces gives us a w, such that $\mathcal{L}_{A_1} w = 0$ and $w|_{\partial M} = g$. Theorem 2.4 then gives us:

$$\int_{\partial M \setminus F_\epsilon} \langle \partial_\nu(v-\omega), f\rangle = \int_M \big(|A_2|^2 - |A_1|^2\big) + \int_M \langle A_1 - A_2, v d\bar{u} - \bar{u} dv\rangle$$

Observe we have the following inclusions: $F(-\infty) = F \subset \partial M_-$ and $\partial M \setminus F_\epsilon \subset \partial M_+$ and moreover, we have $\partial_\nu x_1 = dx_1(\nu) = \nu_1(x) \geq \epsilon$ on $\partial M \setminus F_\epsilon$.

We claim that the term on left hand side in the above equality is $O(|\tau|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ – it is bounded by (using Cauchy-Schwarz):

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|\sqrt{\partial_\nu x_1} e^{-sx_1} \partial_\nu(v-w)\|_{\partial M_+} \times \|c^{-\frac{n-2}{4}}(v_2 + r_2)\|_{\partial M_+} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \Big(\sqrt{h}\|e^{-\tau x_1}\mathcal{L}_{A_1}(v-w)\|_M + \|\sqrt{-\partial_\nu x_1} e^{-\tau x_1}\partial_\nu(v-w)\|_{\partial M_-}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

by applying the Carleman estimate with the boundary part from Remark 3.2, since $v|_{\partial M} = w|_{\partial M}$. The second summand is zero by the assumption; the first one is bounded by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{A_1}(v-w) = \mathcal{L}_{A_2} v &= \big(\mathcal{L}_{A_2} - \mathcal{L}_{A_1}\big)v \\ &= -2(A_1 - A_2, dv) + d^*(A_1 - A_2)v - \big(|A_1|^2 - |A_2|^2\big)v = O(|\tau|)\end{aligned}$$

as $\|e^{-\tau x_1} dv\| = O(|\tau|)$, which proves the claim.

Finally, if we quotient out by τ and take the limit $\tau \to \infty$ as before, we now have the left hand side going to zero by the estimate and the proof of $d(A_1 - A_2) = 0$ finishes in the same way.

Remark 5.12. In the case of a topologically non-trivial line bundle E, we can easily follow the lines of the proof of Theorem 5.9 to get that $d(A_1 - A_2) = 0$ (note that End E $= E \otimes E^*$ in this case is a trivial bundle, since we have the identity section, so $A_1 - A_2$ is a proper 1-form on M). Namely, what one can do is to take the partition of unity used in the construction of the CGOs subordinate to V_is and W_js (see the

equations (5.4) and the paragraph below it); now in each of these charts we may trivialise the bundle and by essentially re-running the last part of Theorem 5.4 and Remark 5.8 dealing with the concentration properties, we get the limit of each individual term in the partition of unity; summing over again, we obtain the desired limit – the equation (5.10). Then the rest of proof of Theorem 5.10 applies.

Remark 5.13. We have proved that Cauchy data uniquely determines dA, however ideally we would like to determine the connection up to gauge equivalence, which is finer than just determining dA. On simply-connected manifolds, the vanishing of the de Rham cohomology would then yield the gauge; moreover, in this case we may recover a scalar potential, too (once we gauge transform one connection to the other, this would follow from the proof of Theorem 1.2 from [11]). However, we can make the case without the potential right even on non simply-connected manifolds; the proof is contained in the next section and the idea is to consider $A_2 - A_1$ as a flat connection and to use a unique continuation principle.

Remark 5.14. Having been through the lengthy proof of existence of Gaussian Beams in case of the connection Laplacian, we now give an alternative idea on how to generalise the notion of quasimodes. Namely, it is natural to attempt to construct the analogous quantity to the approximate eigenfunction that satisfies $\|(\Delta - s^2)v_s\|_{L^2(M)} = o(|\tau|)$ by asking that $\|(-d_A^* d_A - s^2)v_s\|_{L^2(M)} = o(|\tau|)$ for sections of a vector bundle. However, by generalising in this way, we loose the purpose of it: we cannot build the CGO solutions using such construction. Thus, even though the construction of such solutions *should* be possible and completely analogous to our main construction, we cannot find any application for it.

6 Holonomy and Cauchy data

Given a manifold M and a Hermitian vector bundle E on it, equipped with a unitary connection ∇, we can define the parallel transport along piecewise smooth curves in M, which is an isometry on the fibers. In particular, when this curve is a loop at a point p, we end up with an isometry of the fibre E_p, i.e. $P_\gamma : E_p \to E_p$ which preserves the Hermitian inner product. When $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with the standard structure, P_γ is a unitary matrix. The *holonomy group* at p is defined as:

$$H_p(\nabla) = \{P_\gamma : E_p \to E_p \mid \gamma \text{ a closed loop at } p\}$$

This naturally defines a group and moreover satisfies $P_{\gamma\cdot\gamma'} = P_\gamma \cdot P_{\gamma'}$ under path concatenation. We can also define the *restricted* holonomy group as the group $H_p^0(\nabla)$ consisting of parallel transports along contractible loops – which yields a surjective homomorphism $\rho_p^\nabla : \pi_1(M,p) \to H_p(\nabla)/H_p^0(\nabla)$ called the *holonomy representation.* On a fixed connected manifold, these groups for varying points are all isomorphic upon conjugation by an appropriate element.

There is a close connection between the holonomy and the curvature. Namely, one can say that "the curvature is an infinitesimal of the deviation of the holonomy"; more concretely, if we are given a parallelogram in a coordinate chart determined by two coordinate axes, say x_1 and x_2, then $F_{12}u = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial s \partial t} T_{s,t} u$, where F_{12} is the corresponding component of the curvature tensor and $T_{s,t}$ is the parallel transport along parallelogram at vertices $(0,0)$, $(s,0)$, (s,t), $(0,t)$. For our purposes, we will need the fact that homotopic paths have the same holonomy if the curvature is zero:

Lemma 6.1. *If the curvature F is zero, then $H_p^0(M) = 0$ for all $p \in M$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma : I \times I \to M$ be a smooth homotopy between a loop γ and the constant loop at $p \in M$, fixing the endpoints. We will make use of the identity:

$$\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}}\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial y}}V - \nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial y}}\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}}V = F(\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial y})V$$

where V is any section. Let us put $V_{x,t} = T_{x,t}v$ for some $v \in E_p$, where $T_{x,t}$ is parallel transport along $\sigma(x,\cdot)$; also $\sigma(0,t) = p$ and $\sigma(1,t) = \gamma(t)$. Then we must have $0 = \nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}}\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial t}}V_{x,t} = \nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial t}}\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}}V_{x,t}$, which implies that $\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}}V_{x,t}$ is parallel along $\sigma(x,\cdot)$ for all x. But $V_{x,0} = v$ and $\sigma(x,0) = p$ for all x and so we have $\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}}V_{x,0} = 0$ for all x. By uniqueness of solution, we must have $\nabla_{\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}}V_{x,t} \equiv 0$. Therefore, $V_{x,t}$ is parallel along $\sigma(\cdot,t)$ for all t. Since we know that $V_{0,1} = T_{0,1}v = v$ and $\sigma(x,1) = p$ for all x, we must also have $V_{1,1} = T_{1,1}v = v = P_\gamma v$ and thus parallel transport along γ is trivial. □

This means that for zero curvature, the holonomy representation is simply a map from π_1 to the holonomy group. As a warm up, let us point out some details about the construction of the parallel transport matrix. Namely, assume $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$ with a unitary connection A has trivial holonomy and fix a point $p \in M$. Consider the matrix obtained by parallel transporting along curves emanating from p and define $F(p') = P_{\gamma(p,p')}$ where $\gamma(p,p')$ is a path between p and p'. Since the holonomy is trivial, we have F well defined. Therefore, we have $dF + AF = 0$ for all $(x,v) \in TM$ and we also have $FF^* = Id$, since A is unitary. Therefore $F^{-1}AF + F^{-1}dF = 0$ and so A is equivalent to the trivial connection and moreover the covariant derivative satisfies $F^{-1}(d+A)F = d + 0$. Moreover, if we fix $p \in \partial M$ and assume that $\iota^*_{\partial M}A = 0$, we will have $F|_{\partial M} = Id$, so the two connections will be gauge equivalent!

We could ask the same question from before with partial data instead of full data assumption on the Cauchy spaces. Here, Cauchy spaces with partial data means we consider an open (non-empty) part of the boundary $\Gamma \subset \partial M$ and the set:

$$C^\Gamma_{A,Q} = \left\{ \left(u|_\Gamma, \nabla^A_\nu(u)|_\Gamma \right) \middle| \mathcal{L}_{A,Q}u = 0 \text{ and } u|_{\partial M\setminus\bar{\Gamma}} = 0, u \in H^1(M) \right\}$$

where Q is a section of the endomorphism bundle.

The purpose of the following lemma is to show that we can reduce the proof of Theorem 6.3 to the case $B|_{\partial M} = 0$, which is useful as the covariant normal derivative in this case becomes the usual normal derivative. This is handy because most results on unique continuation for elliptic systems work with usual normal derivative at the boundary, as in [17] or [6] in the Remark 6.5 below.

Lemma 6.2 (Moral: pick correct gauge at the start)**.** *Let B be a unitary connection on $E = M \times \mathbb{C}^m$. Consider the tubular neighbourhood $\partial M \times [0,\epsilon)$ of the boundary for some $\epsilon > 0$ and denote the normal distance coordinate (from ∂M) by t. Then B is gauge equivalent to a unitary connection A, via an automorphism F of E such that $F|_{\partial M} = Id$ and $A(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}) = 0$ in the neighbourhood $\partial M \times [0,\delta)$ of the boundary, for some $\delta > 0$.*

Proof. Let us denote $B(\frac{\partial}{\partial t})$ by B_t. Then consider the following first order system of differential equations:

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(x',t) + B_t(x',t)F(x',t) = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad F|_{\partial M} = Id$$

where F is an $m \times m$ matrix, for $(x',t) \in \partial M \times [0,\epsilon)$. This system has a unique smooth solution in a neighbourhood of ∂M of the form $\partial M \times [0,\delta')$, for some positive δ' with $\epsilon > \delta'$. Moreover, F is unitary, since B_t is skew-Hermitian.

Furthermore, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that F takes values in the exponential chart of $U(n)$ for points in $\partial M \times [0, \delta)$, with $\delta < \delta'$. Then we may take a compactly supported function φ on $[0, \delta')$, with $\varphi = 1$ on $[0, \delta)$, and define ρ on M by setting $\rho(x, t) = \varphi(t)$ in $\partial M \times [0, \delta')$ and zero elsewhere. Then we may define the unitary extension $\tilde{F} = e^{\rho \log F}$; clearly $\tilde{F}|_{\partial M \times [0,\delta)} = F$.

Then we may define the new unitary connection by setting $A = \tilde{F}^{-1} B \tilde{F} + \tilde{F}^{-1} d\tilde{F}$. One checks that the desired properties are satisfied, as we have for $(x', t) \in \partial M \times [0, \delta)$:

$$A_t(x', t) = F^{-1}(x', t)(B_t(x', t)F(x', t) + \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(x', t)) = 0$$

by the construction.

□

Let us now briefly remark that in the next result, we will use the *boundary determination* result Theorem 4.6, that we already mentioned in Section 4.5. For the scalar case, see Section 8 in [10]; the result for $m \geq 2$ is in preparation in another text from the author. The basic idea is that the full jets of the quantities, such as the connection or the metric, can be restored from the full symbol of the pseudodifferential operator at the boundary determined by the DN map. Let us formulate the main theorem of this section more precisely (see also [13], Theorem 6.1):

Theorem 6.3. *Let E be a Hermitian vector bundle, equipped with two flat, unitary connections A and B, and Γ an open, connected, non-empty subset of the boundary ∂M. Then the Cauchy data spaces agree, i.e. $C_A^\Gamma = C_B^\Gamma$ if and only if $\iota_\Gamma^*(A - B) = 0$ and the holonomy representations satisfy $\rho^A = \rho^B$.*

Proof. Let us firstly assume $C_A^\Gamma = C_B^\Gamma$. We know this implies by boundary determination that $\iota_\Gamma^*(B - A) = 0$. Consider $p_1 \in \Gamma$ and a loop γ starting at p_1. By standard differential topology, we can always homotopically perturb the curve such that we end up with two pieces of it: $\gamma_1 : [0, 1] \to M$ starting at p_1 and ending at $p_2 \neq p_1 \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma(0, 1) \subset \text{int } M$; and $\gamma_2 : [1, 2] \to M$ starting at p_2 and ending at p_1 and $\text{Image}(\gamma_2) \subset \Gamma$. We moreover ask that $\gamma_{1,2}$ are embedded curves (we can always do this for curves in dimension $n \geq 3$ by using a version of the weak Whitney theorem to approximate; then we apply a result which says when we are close to a curve uniformly, we are homotopic to it – for the case $n = 2$ see Remark 6.6). In order to show that the holonomies are equal, it suffices to show the parallel transports along γ_1 are equal, as $\iota_\Gamma^*(B - A) = 0$.

We consider a tubular neighbourhood of γ_1; every such is of form $\mathcal{O} = \{p \in \text{int } M : \text{dist}(p, \gamma_1) < \epsilon\} \cong (0, 1) \times B_\epsilon(0)$, where $B_\epsilon(0)$ is an $(n-1)$-dimensional ball (every vector bundle over a contractible space is trivial). Therefore, we know $\mathcal{O}$ is simply connected and therefore has trivial holonomy $H_{p_1}(\mathcal{O}, B|_\mathcal{O}) = \{0\}$; here we also used that B is flat and similarly for A. We consider $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\text{dist}(p_1, p_2) > 2\epsilon$, so that we have this cylindrical neighbourhood with disjoint ends. Denote $U_1 = \{p \in \Gamma : \text{dist}(p, p_1) < \epsilon\}$.

Now since both connections are flat and $\mathcal{O}$ is simply-connected, we get a unitary isomorphism F between them: F is obtained by taking parallel transport matrices from p of both connections and composing them in a suitable way. We also have $F|_{U_1} = Id$, as $\iota_\Gamma^*(B - A) = 0$. Now we go to the Cauchy data – let u_1 and u_2 solve $\mathcal{L}_A u_1 = \mathcal{L}_B u_2 = 0$ with same boundary data $u_1|_\Gamma = u_2|_\Gamma = f$; here $\mathcal{L}_A = \nabla_A^* \nabla_A$ and $\mathcal{L}_B = \nabla_B^* \nabla_B$. Define $u = F u_1$ in $\mathcal{O}$; we want to prove that $u = u_2$ on $\mathcal{O}$.

Since $F|_{U_1} = Id$, we have $u|_{U_1} = u_1|_{U_1} = u_2|_{U_1} = f|_{U_1}$. Also, using the introduction to this section and the definition of F, we have $F^* \nabla_B F = \nabla_A$ in $\mathcal{O}$ (F is unitary).

Therefore, we must have:

$$\mathcal{L}_A = F^*\nabla_B^* F F^* \nabla_B F = F^* \mathcal{L}_B F \tag{6.1}$$

which implies that $\mathcal{L}_B u = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}$. Moreover, we have $\nabla_\nu^B u = \nabla_\nu^B u_2$ on U_1:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\nu^B u &= (dFu_1 + Fdu_1)(\nu) + B(\nu)u = (FA(\nu) - B(\nu)F)u_1 + B(\nu)u + F\partial_\nu u_1 \\ &= \partial_\nu u_1 + A(\nu)u_1 = \nabla_\nu^A u_1 = \nabla_\nu^B u_2\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the fact that $C_A^\Gamma = C_B^\Gamma$. So now we have:

$$\mathcal{L}_B(u - u_2) = 0, \quad (u - u_2)|_{U_1} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_\nu^B|_{U_1}(u - u_2) = 0$$

so by a result concerning the *unique continuation* properties of elliptic systems of equations (see Remark 6.5 below), we must have $u \equiv u_2$ in $\mathcal{O}$; hence we must also have equality at p_2 by letting $p \in \mathcal{O}$ converge to p_2, i.e. $F(p_2)f(p_2) = f(p_2)$. Here f is smooth and free to choose and therefore, we must have $F(p_2) = Id$. This concludes the proof that the holonomies are equal.

Conversely, to show that A and B have the same Cauchy data under the given assumptions, just follow the paragraph before the theorem ($B = 0$ case); however, note that since we do not know that the holonomy is trivial, parallel transport from a point might not be well-defined, so we have to do something else. The idea is to provide a global horizontal section of the endomorphism bundle that is identity at the boundary and relate this with holonomy.

Induce the standard unitary connection on the $\mathrm{End}E$ bundle by $\nabla^{\mathrm{End}} u = \nabla_B u - u\nabla_A$; one can easily check this new connection to be flat, as A and B are. Note that in a local trivialisation this is just $\hat{A}(R) = BR - RA$, where $\hat{A}$ is the new connection matrix and R is a matrix. We would like to construct a unitary automorphism U of E, such that $U|_\Gamma = Id$ and $U^*\nabla_A U = \nabla_B$. We do this as follows.

Fix $p_1 \in \Gamma$ as before and take a loop at p_1, homotope it as before and assume we are working in the tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$. Then A and B are equivalent to a trivial connection over $\mathcal{O}$; take the parallel transport matrices F and G s.t. $dF + AF = dG + BG = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}$. Then one checks for $H = FG^{-1}$:

$$dH = dGF^{-1} + GdF^{-1} = -BGF^{-1} + GF^{-1}A = HA - BH$$

One also sees that $H|_{U_1} = Id$ as $\iota_\Gamma(A - B) = 0$; also, as $\rho_A = \rho_B$ and the parallel transport along paths in Γ is the same for A and B, we have that $H|_{U_2} = Id$, too. Now as $H(\gamma_1(t))$ is parallel transport with respect to $\hat{A}$, we get the parallel transport of Id along γ_1 at p_2 is Id; therefore parallel transport of Id along γ is trivial. So we can define $U(x)$ to be parallel transport of Id from p_1 to x, for every $x \in M$ and this finishes the proof. □

Remark 6.4. Moreover, in the case of line bundles, it is true that for any two connections A_1 and A_2: $C_{A_1}^\Gamma = C_{A_2}^\Gamma$ if and only if $d(A_1 - A_2) = 0$, $\iota_\Gamma^*(A_1 - A_2) = 0$ and the holonomy representation of $A_1 - A_2$ is trivial. This can be easily seen from the above proof.

Remark 6.5. There are a few references for the unique continuation result we are quoting, but none of them seems to be in the exact form we need. More concretely, Theorem 2.3 in [19] does the case of the wave equation (which covers our setting if we let u independent of t) with the covariant normal derivative at the boundary and so

solves our problem – however, it is not ideal since it gives more than we need; more adequate are techniques in Corollary 3.4 and Theorem 3.2 in [6] which can also be used (although they do not use the covariant derivative), since for an elliptic operator, any smooth surface is pseudoconvex, so this covers $B|_{\partial M} = 0$ case (this suffices – see Lemma 6.2). See also Appendix B in [17].

Remark 6.6. In the case of surfaces, we need to be careful when approximating curves by embeddings – we do not have enough space to get rid of possible self-intersections. However, there is a way around this by considering just the class of simple curves, by which we can represent generators of π_1 (see [13], Section 6, for details). Furthermore, in [13] the Conjecture 1.1 for Riemann surfaces and line bundles is proved, but with the extra bit of a potential added to the connection Laplacian (so the claim is more general in that case). There, the authors prove the identification of a potential *before* identification of a connection; in our recovery Theorem 5.10, we must first prove the identification of a connection, so if we conjugate $\mathcal{L}_A + Q_A$ by an automorphism of the bundle as in the equation (6.1) we do not get $\mathcal{L}_B + Q_B$, but rather $\mathcal{L}_B + Q_A$.

Now we are in a good shape to prove the main theorem: all the ingredients are ready. Theorem 5.10 almost finishes the proof, however Theorem 6.3 provides us with the necessary gauge.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Recall that we have $d(A_1 - A_2) = 0$ from Theorem 5.10 and Remark 5.11 after it. By Remark 6.4, we immediately get our gauge. This finishes the proof. □

References

[1] P. Albin, C. Guillarmou, L. Tzou, G. Uhlmann, *Inverse boundary problems for systems in two dimensions*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **14** (2013), 1551–1571.

[2] T. Aubin, Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry, *Springer Monographs in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[3] C. Bär, *Zero sets of solutions to semilinear elliptic systems of first order*, Invent. Math. **138** (1999), 183–202.

[4] F. J. Chung, M. Salo, L. Tzou, *Partial data inverse problems for the Hodge Laplacian*, Anal. PDE (to appear), arXiv:1310.4616.

[5] F. J. Chung, *A partial data result for the magnetic Schrödinger inverse problem*, Anal. PDE **7** (2014), 117–157.

[6] M. Eller, V. Isakov, G. Nakamura, D. Tataru, *Uniqueness and stability in the Cauchy problem for Maxwell and elasticity systems*, in: Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications, Collège de France Seminar, Vol. XIV, in: Stud. Math. Appl. 31, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002, pp. 329-349.

[7] G. Eskin, *Global uniqueness in the inverse scattering problem for the Schrdinger operator with external Yang-Mills potentials*, Comm. Math. Phys. **222** (2001), 503–531.

[8] G. Eskin, J. Ralston, *On the inverse boundary value problem for linear isotropic elasticity and Cauchy-Riemann systems*, in Inverse problems and spectral theory, Contemp. Math. **348**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 53–69.

[9] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, C. Kenig, J. Sjöstrand, G. Uhlmann, *Determining a magnetic Schrödinger operator from partial Cauchy data*, Comm. Math. Phys. **271** (2007), 467–488.

[10] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, C. Kenig, M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, *Limiting Carleman weights and anisotropic inverse problems*, Invent. Math. **178** (2009), 119–171.

[11] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, M. Salo, *The Calderón problem in transversally anisotropic geometries*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (to appear), arXiv:1305.1273.

[12] O. Forster, Lectures on Riemann surfaces, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* **81**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[13] C. Guillarmou, L. Tzou, *Identification of a connection from Cauchy data on a Riemann surface with boundary*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), 393–418.

[14] C. Guillarmou, *Lens rigidity for manifolds with hyperbolic trapped set*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear), arXiv:1412.1760.

[15] C. Guillarmou, G. Paternain, M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, *The X-ray transform for connections in negative curvature*, Comm. Math. Phys. **343** (2016), 83–127.

[16] C. E. Kenig, J. Sjöstrand, G. Uhlmann, *The Calderón problem with partial data*, Ann. of Math. (2) **165** (2007), 567–591.

[17] C. E. Kenig, M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, *Inverse problems for the anisotropic Maxwell equations*, Duke Math. J. **157** (2011), 369–419.

[18] S. Kobayashi, Differential geometry of complex vector bundles, *Publications of the Mathematical Society of Japan* **15**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1987.

[19] Y. Kurylev, L. Oksanen, G. P. Paternain, *Inverse problems for the connection Laplacian*, preprint (2015), arXiv:1509.02645.

[20] J. M. Lee, G. Uhlmann, *Determining anisotropic real-analytic conductivities by boundary measurements*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **42** (1989), 1097–1112.

[21] G. Nakamura, G. Uhlmann, *Complex geometrical optics solutions and pseudoanalytic matrices*, Ill-posed and inverse problems, 305–338, VSP, Zeist, 2002.

[22] G. P. Paternain, *Inverse problems for connections*, Inverse problems and applications: inside out II, 369–409, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. **60**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2013.

[23] G. P. Paternain, M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, H. Zhou, *The geodesic X-ray transform with matrix weights*, preprint (2016), arXiv:1605.07894.

[24] M. Salo, *The Calderón problem on Riemannian manifolds*, Inverse problems and applications: inside out. II, 167–247, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. **60**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2013.

[25] P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, A. Vasy, *Inverting the local geodesic X-ray transform on tensors*, J. Anal. Math. (to appear), arXiv:1410.5145.

[26] R. S. Strichartz, *Analysis of the Laplacian on the complete Riemannian manifold*, J. Funct. Anal. **52** (1983), 48–79.

[27] J. Sylvester, G. Uhlmann, *A global uniqueness theorem for an inverse boundary value problem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **125** (1987), 153–169.

[28] G. Uhlmann, A. Vasy, *The inverse problem for the local geodesic ray transform* (with an appendix by H. Zhou), Invent. Math. **205** (2016), 83–120.

Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK

E-mail address: m.cekic@dpmms.cam.ac.uk